DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 068 617 UD 013 007

AUTHOR	Triandis, Harry C.; And Others
TITLE	The Perceptions of Implicative Relationships Among Black and White Adolescents and the Hardcore Unemployed. Illinois Studies of the Economically Disadvantaged.
INSTITUTION	Illinois Univ., Urbana. Dept. of Psychology.
SPONS AGENCY	Social and Rehabilitation Service (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	TR-8
PUB DATE	Feb 71
NOTE	196p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS	Adolescents; *Caucasian Students; Cognitive Processes; College Students; Economically Disadvantaged; Females; High School Students; Jobs; *Logical Thinking; *Negro Students; Race Relations; Spanish Speaking; *Unemployed; *Young Adults
IDENTIFIERS	Illinois

ABSTRACT

This study examines the perceived antecedents and consequents of certain concepts that are central to life in the black ghetto and to black and white interactions in job settings, as they are perceived by samples of blacks and whites. This study had two main goals: (a) instrument development; and (b) the gathering of data on subjective culture--that is, the typical ways in which the samples tested perceive their social environment. To reach these goals, it was desirable that as many disparate samples as possible should be used. It was possible to obtain four geographically and demographically distinct samples: (1) white female college students, who filled out the questionnaire as part of a course requirement in an introductory psychology course; (2) black working-class and lower-class high school boys from the Chicago Heights area; (3) white high school boys, working-class and lower class, and some Spanish speaking adult males from Chicago Heights; and, (4) black adult subjects, classified as "hardcore unemployed," from St. Louis, Missouri. Two open-ended elicitation questionnaires were prepared. The instructions to the subjects were "translated" by five black university students into "Black English" and back into standard English to insure that they would be understood by all subjects. (Author/JM)

ED 068617

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN
URBANA, ILLINOIS 61801

Illinois Studies of the Economically Disadvantaged

THE PERCEPTIONS OF IMPLICATIVE RELATIONSHIPS AMONG BLACK AND WHITE ADOLESCENTS AND THE HARDCORE UNEMPLOYED

Harry C. Triandis, Jack M. Feldman
University of Illinois

and

William M. Harvey
St. Louis Narcotics Service Council

Technical Report No. 8

February, 1971

This investigation was supported, in part, by Research Grant No. 12-P-55175/5-02
from the Social and Rehabilitation Service
Department of Health, Education and Welfare
Washington, D. C., 20201

Harry C. Triandis
Principal Investigator

UD 013007

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Preface

This report is part of a series which will be concerned with the economically disadvantaged. We plan to test the assumption that economic disadvantages create characteristic ways of perceiving and thinking about the social environment. We call such characteristic perceptions the "subjective culture" of a particular group. We expect to find characteristic differences in the subjective cultures of blacks and whites who differ in level of economic advantage. We suspect that such differences in subjective culture lead to major barriers in communication between an employee and his supervisor, his fellow employees and his subordinates. Our plan is to determine the differences in subjective culture by employing a battery of newly developed procedures, tailormade to detect cultural differences; we then plan to incorporate this information in specially designed training programs; finally, we hope to test the effectiveness of these training programs by examining the effects of training on measures of occupational stability.

The present report is the fourth of four reports that examine the characteristic ways of perceiving the social environment of economically disadvantaged white and black young males and hardcore unemployed blacks. Our comparison group consists of college girls. Our major concern here is to get at the contrast that black and white comparisons are likely to provide. Thus, we look only at differences in which the white boys and girls agree on the one hand, and the two black samples agree with each other, on the other hand. It should be stressed here that our sampling has been deliberately most selective: our blacks are not ordinary blacks, but black males with vocational problems; our whites are most heterogeneous. We want to generalize to that situation in which black males with vocational problems try to become integrated in a highly heterogeneous white establishment.

This report deals with the perceptions of the connections between what one does and what one gets from his social environment. Other reports which will come in about a year will explore the generality and implications of our findings for cross-cultural training and for intercultural harmony.

Harry C. Triandis

THE PERCEPTIONS OF IMPLICATIVE RELATIONSHIPS AMONG BLACK AND WHITE ADOLESCENTS AND THE HARDCORE UNEMPLOYED[1]

Harry C. Triandis, Jack M. Feldman
University of Illinois

and

William M. Harvey
St. Louis Narcotics Service Council

It has been known for some time (Fishbein, 1967; Peak, 1955; Rosenberg, 1956; Vroom, 1964) that the perceived connections between an act and a goal are related to attitudes and are central to analyses of motivation. Such perceptions can provide convenient ways of analyzing values (Triandis, Kilty, Shanmugam, Tanaka & Vassiliou, 1971).

Specifically, Triandis et al (1971) examined the perceived implications of concepts in two ways: First, they examined what particular antecedents are perceived to lead, cause or imply a particular concept; second, what particular consequents are perceived to follow, be caused, or be implied by this same concept. Thus, by selecting 20 value or disvalue concepts, such as TRUTH, HAPPINESS and DEATH, and by asking persons in Illinois, U.S.A.; Mysore, India; Tokyo, Japan; and Athens, Greece to first provide sentence completions involving antecedents and consequents of these 20 concepts, and then, to select the "best" antecedents or consequents of these concepts, they demonstrated that these diverse populations of persons have very different conceptions of the implicative relationships among concepts. Careful examination of the responses of the subjects allowed comparison of both the similarities and differences of the responses of the subjects to the 20 concepts. One of the findings was that each culture had a particular dominant theme which occurred as an antecedent of *good* concepts. Americans stressed *respect*; Greeks *competition* and the *need to control the individual by means of social controls*; the Indians stressed that one *inherits* things which then lead to good outcomes; the Japanese stressed *peace* and *cooperation*. The consequents of good concepts also showed particular patterns. The Americans saw individual *progress*, *self-confidence*, *good adjustment*, *status*, *serenity* and *satisfaction* as outcomes of good concepts; the Greeks saw *societal well being*, in the form of higher forms of *civilization*, *glory* and *victory*, and individual well being, in the form of *receiving more love* and *greater appreciation from others*; the Indians saw increased *status*, *glory* and *societal well being*; the Japanese *serenity*, *aesthetic satisfaction*, *self-confidence*, *peace*, *advancement* and *good adjustment*. It is notable, that the Americans and the Japanese showed great similarity in their responses to several concepts, although they were different when they dealt with aesthetic issues. The Indians were most different from the Americans. The Greeks were somewhere between the Indians and the Americans, but rather closer to the Indians than the Americans. Other kinds of data (Triandis & Vassiliou, 1971) are consistent with the observations about the similarities of the Greeks to other groups.

---

[1] The research reported here was supported by the Social and Rehabilitation Services of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Research Grant No. 12-P-55175/5-02. We are deeply grateful to Michael Ross and Kenneth Weaver who supervised data collection in two of our samples. They were assisted by Chet Brown, Henry F. Davis, William Gardner, Caleb Johnson, Jr., Don Leach, Allen Long, Herman Standberry and Joseph Takash. We also wish to thank James Savage for his critical comments of an earlier version of this report.

Haried (1969) employed the antecedent-consequent analysis as a method to study the meaning of concepts utilized by accountants, persons handling financial statements, and the general public. He presented to his subjects a financial report that contained the critical concepts. He found a number of differences in the meaning of such concepts that are perfectly understandable. For instance, the antecedents of *good will* were seen as involving good deeds by the general public, suggesting that they do not understand the technical meaning of this concept when it appears in financial reports.

The present study examines the perceived antecedents and consequents of certain concepts that are central to life in the black ghetto, and to black and white interactions in job settings, as they are perceived by samples of blacks and whites.

Method

Subject Population

This study had two main goals: (a) instrument development and (b) the gathering of data on subjective culture, that is, the typical ways in which the samples tested perceive their social environment. To reach these goals it was desirable that as many disparate samples as possible should be used. This heterogeneity is meant to insure the external validity of the subjective culture data and to provide intersubject variance for instrument development.

It was possible to obtain four geographically and demographically distinct samples:

(1) White female college students, who filled out the questionnaire as part of a course requirement in an introductory psychology course. (White females were used because the investigators felt that they are the best examples of carriers of white middle-class culture, and thus would provide an "extreme-groups" comparison [illegible] the black samples.)

(2) Black working-class and lower-class high school boys from the Chicago Heights area (a southern suburb of Chicago).

(3) White high school boys, working-class and lower-class, and some Spanish speaking adult males from Chicago Heights.

(4) Black adult subjects, classified as "hardcore unemployed," from St. Louis, Missouri.

No attempt was made to have the same person respond to all the questionnaires. A major reason for this was that the questionnaires required as much as 15 hours of testing time (for some subjects). Thus, for each sample we established a pool of subjects out of which we drew the subjects that answered each particular questionnaire.

The white girls were approximately 19 years old, practically all of them unmarried, most of them from various parts of Illinois, including farms and other rural areas, with family backgrounds characteristic of the middle class. The pool from which we drew had 83 girls.

The white boys were on the average a year younger than the white girls. A pool of 43 young men, in their late teens or early twenties, was established from among those who were in a pre-vocational work adjustment training program at a high school in the outskirts of Chicago, Illinois. The high school considered these men socially maladjusted, but their I.Q's were in the normal or high range. The maladjustment may have been related to factors such as cultural deprivation, educational retardation, inadequate school opportunities, or parental mobility which did not allow the young men to stay in school for sufficiently long periods of time. One quarter to one-third of these subjects were expected by school authorities to be hardcore-unemployed, unless some drastic retraining was made available to them. As a result they were in the Man Power Development Training Program of their high school, learning skills such as welding, auto mechanics, and machine operation. Another quarter was referred to the Illinois Division of Vocational Rehabilitation, because of "adjustment problems." Finally, another quarter consisted of Spanish Americans who had language and cultural adjustment difficulties. They were in the training programs in order to acquire skills which would lead to employment.

The black high school subjects were drawn from a pool of 60 males, who were in the same program at the same high school as the white boys described in the previous paragraph. Their ages ranged from 15-21, with a mean of about 16 and a half. About 20 of the 60 responded to five of the six questionnaires. Thus, there is a tendency for the subjects with better working habits (in the sense that they were willing and able to return several times to the test sessions) to be over-represented in this sample. The subjects were typical of the blacks found in "suburban ghettoes," such as one finds in the outskirts of large cities. Some of their parents were middle-class, but most came from homes in which the mother was the major income-maker, and where the income levels were very low. The students were classified as maladjusted because of gambling, drinking, sexual problems or drug abuse. Most of these subjects had police records. All were in the normal I.Q. range, and some even aspired to go to college. The training they received in the special programs was identical to that of the white boys described in the previous paragraph.

The black hardcore came from a pool of males, from the inner city in St. Louis, Missouri. They were on the average 26 years old, had a history of unemployment, drug abuse and most of them had police records.

The design of this study specified data collection from 20 college girls and 40 of each of the other groups, but due to problems in obtaining subjects, the actual N's are somewhat smaller. N's used in the analyses range from 97 to 100. Further biographical details of the subject population may be found in Table 1 for the study of antecedents and Table 2 for the study of consequents.

Questionnaire Development

The investigators developed a list of events and behaviors which were felt to be relevant to, and important in, the lives of ghetto residents. This list was reviewed with a number of consultants, including experts on interracial relations, black psychologists and five black students from ghetto backgrounds attending the University of Illinois under the Special Educational Opportunities Program (SEOP). (The SEOP students were hired to consult on many phases of the research, as will be seen below.) Changes suggested by these consultants were made in the list until 35 behaviors and events, felt by all to be important were obtained.

Antecedents and consequents of each behavior or event were elicited from members of the populations defined above. Two open-ended elicitation questionnaires were prepared and subjects were asked to write three things that must precede each event (antecedents) or three things that follow each event (consequents).[2] The instructions to the subjects were "translated" by the five black university students into "Black English" (language usually used in the ghetto) and back into standard English to insure that they would be understood by all subjects. This "decentering" (Werner & Campbell, 1970) procedure is used in cross-cultural research, and allows for the development of translation equivalent versions of a written text.

The method begins with a text in language A, which is translated into language B. A different group of bilinguals translates B back to A', and a comparison between A and A' leads to a modification of A, to become simpler and more easily translatable into B. The new version of A, which might be designated as A'', is then translated into B, and the new version of B' is

---

[2] The St. Louis population is an exception to this. A group of drug addicts at a Narcotics Rehabilitation Center (NASCO, Inc.) participated in a group discussion of each stimulus person, which was tape recorded and later transcribed.

Table 1

Discriminant Analysis of Biographical Data

by Demographic Group--Antecedents

Group Means on Original Variables

Group	Age	Marital Status	Life in Town	Where Lived	Grade in School	Future Plans	Family Income	Social Class
White college girls	19.30	.10	0.00	2.40	3.70	2.40	3.80	2.60
White high school & Spanish	18.35	.09	.39	1.52	2.17	1.43	3.83	2.57
Black high school	15.91	.03	.52	1.64	2.00	1.42	3.21	2.64
Black hardcore	27.94	.44	.65	1.32	2.12	.68	2.94	2.38

Scaled Vectors of Discriminant Functions

Variable	Function 1	Function 2
Age	3.77	4.41
Marital Status	1.39	1.87
Life in town	1.82	-1.83
Where lived	-1.26	- .04
Grade in school	-4.34	4.38
Future plans	-3.57	1.29
Family income	1.35	- .99
Social class	- .95	-1.14
% of variance	65.91	30.03

Group Means on Discriminant Functions

Group	Function 1	Function 2
White college girls	-2.42	3.76
White high school and Spanish	- .80	2.29
Black high school	- .90	1.96
Black hardcore	.40	2.99

Overall F ratio = 6.71 (df = 24, 259) $p < .01$

Table 2

Discriminant Analysis of Biographical Data by Demongraphic Group--Consequents

Group Means on Original Variables

Group	Age	Marital Status	Life in Town	Where Lived	Grade in School	Future Plans	Family Income	Social Class
White college girls	17.88	.12	.06	2.12	3.76	2.35	4.18	3.00
White high school & Spanish	18.06	.06	.39	1.61	2.00	1.50	3.72	2.56
Black high school	14.06	.00	.48	1.61	1.91	1.27	3.30	2.48
Black hardcore	26.00	.45	.59	1.14	2.14	.76	2.55	2.41

Scaled Vectors of Discriminant Functions

Variable	Function 1	Function 2
Age	1.54	1.67
Marital Status	.89	2.92
Life in town	2.21	-.34
Where lived	1.68	-.29
Grade in school	-4.19	1.69
Future plans	-3.04	-.39
Family income	-.07	-2.00
Social class	-1.11	1.15
% of variance	74.07	24.49

Group Means on Discriminant Functions

Group	Function 1	Function 2
White college girls	-3.28	1.01
White high school and Spanish	-1.58	.51
Black high school	-1.46	.43
Black hardcore	-1.06	1.29

Overall F ratio = 10.30 (df = 24.250) $p < .01$

back translated into A'''. When changes have been made in such a way as to reclaim the original text, e.g., A''' = A'''', the two versions A''' and B''' are used in the research project. In our case, however, it was decided to utilize a decentered version in standard English, on the grounds that (a) our subjects did understand standard English, and (b) black English is an oral language, and the presentation of a questionnaire in black English would look "phony" to our black subjects. The major advantage of the decentered version in standard English is that it contains mostly words that are familiar to ghetto blacks, and a style which is sufficiently simple to permit translation into black ways of encoding reality. At the same time, the decentered version is perfectly suitable for use with middle-class subjects, so that all subjects did respond to the same questionnaires.

Questionnaire responses were tabulated for each population separately, for both the antecedent and consequent questionnaires. The 15 most frequent antecedents and consequents of each event or behavior across all samples (but representing both black and white responses) were selected for inclusion in the final questionnaires. These 15 items per stimulus concept are unique in most cases--very few items are repeated across events. This is due to the highly specific nature of the events and behaviors that are dealt with in this context.

Procedure

Because the questionnaire administrators had reported some difficulty in reading the instructions on the part of the non-college samples, orally administered instructions were prepared. These instructions were decentered in the same manner as the elicitation instructions. Subjects were asked to write a number from 0 to 9 in the space next to each word or phrase under a given event or behavior, corresponding to the likelihood that the item would lead to the stimulus concept (antecedent) or that the item would result from the concept (consequent). Each number was labelled with a descriptive word or phrase. The scale from 0 to 9 and the corresponding labels were reproduced at the bottom of each page. A single stimulus concept appeared on a page, and the pages of the antecedent and consequent questionnaires were assembled in three different random orders. Within a page, the 15 items were presented in an invariant order. A biographical data sheet, asking the subject's age, marital status, education, family income, and social class identification, was included in every questionnaire. A "practice sheet," described below, was administered to each subject before he responded to the actual instrument.

The 0 to 9 scale format was selected to partially control response bias and/or careless responding on the subject's part. It was felt that having the subject select and write a number next to each alternative would force increased attention to the task, as opposed to simply asking for check marks on a graphic scale.

The "practice sheet" for each task served two purposes. It familiarized the subject with the task, and allowed questionnaire administrators to check the subject's comprehension of the rating task. The practice sheets consisted of simplified versions of the rating task with obvious answers. Questionnaire administrators received a sheet with criteria for answering. If a subject's answers did not correspond to the criteria, the administrator questionned him as to why he had answered in that way. If the subject's answer showed that he understood the task, but had different ideas about the ratings than the criteria would indicate, he was allowed to continue. If he could not explain his ratings, and the administrator's repeated instructions could not produce understanding, the subject was excused. Approximately 10% of the black samples were excused.

Results

Because only unique items (antecedents and consequents) were used for each stimulus, each stimulus on both questionnaires was analyzed separately. The method of principal component analysis with discriminant analysis was chosen as most appropriate to the data (see Triandis, Feldman, & Harvey, 1970). This analytic method is intended to describe each stimulus event in terms of the antecedents or consequents associated with it, and reveal any perceptual differences which exist among the four demographically-defined subject groups.

The analysis was done in three stages. A principal component analysis was performed on the matrix of cross products, scaled by 1/N. A matrix of factor loadings, factor scores, and eigenvectors was obtained. The factor score matrix and factor loading matrix were then rotated by the Harris-Kaiser (1964, pp. 356-360) "independent clusters" method, which involved a non-normalized varimax rotation of the eigenvector matrix and the application of the resultant transformation matrix to the factor score and factor loading matrices. The principal advantage of this method is that it allows an oblique solution through an orthogonal analytic rotation. Some idea of the shape of the factor space can be obtained by examination of the "factor intercorrelations" in the tables (Appendix I). These represent the cosines of the angles between the axes in the n-dimensional space and not a Pearson r computed on the factor scores. In looking at the tables we note that there are some non-trivial negative loadings, indicating the absence of independent clusters. However, in spite of the non-positive manifolds the rotation is still to a simple structure and readily interpretable.

The reader will note that factor loadings often exceed 1.0. This occurs because the principal component analysis used takes both mean differences and item intercorrelations into account.

The last step in this method was a discriminant function analysis performed on the factor scores for each subject, using as criterion groups the four demographically-defined groups of subjects. This analysis provides orthogonal weighted combinations of factors which maximally discriminate the four groups. Group means on the discriminant functions show which groups are differentiated. For simplicity's sake, only those functions accounting for more than 4% of the between-groups variance are presented.

Appendix I presents tables of results for the analyses described above, in the order in which their verbal interpretations appear below. The first table for a stimulus presents the results for the antecedents questionnaire and the second presents the consequents data. Different numbers of factors were selected for each stimulus person by looking for the point at which the eigenvalues "smooth out"--that is, where differences between successive pairs become more or less constant. The number of factors rotated for each stimulus person represents a consensus of the second author and a junior investigator.

The following sections present the investigators' categorizations of event-stimuli and interpretation of the analyses. The reader who wishes more detailed information may consult Appendix I.

Preconditions for Job-Seeking

Significant differences were obtained for both the antecedents and consequents of FINISHING COLLEGE. Black high school boys are high on work and confidence (be willing to work, have drive, go to classes, study hard, know what you want to do, be interested in what you are doing, have the right attitude, do work the teachers assign, want to learn, believe in yourself) and low on ambition and social pressure (have drive, have friends in college). White high school boys are low on financial factors (be smart, have money, want to "live good").

For consequent perceptions, white college girls are high on independence (get married, don't have to depend on others) and low on future obligations (get more education, go into military service). The college girls were also high on accomplishment (good job, work harder, better pay, feel important, get more education, feel you've accomplished something, get respect, plan for future, move into own apartment, have parents treat you better, believe in yourself).

Significant between-groups discrimination was obtained for both the antecedents and consequents of NOT FINISHING HIGH SCHOOL. White college girls were high, and hardcore blacks low, on the antecedents of: (1) bad student (be expelled, bad grades, [negative] not have anybody to help with personal problems) and (2) discipline problems (skip classes, find a job that looks good, get in trouble in school). Both high school samples were high on motivation (have no ambition, be dumb), but moderate (between the college girls, who are highest, and the hardcore, who are lowest) on personal problems (have no goals, feel like a failure, have no one to help you with personal problems).

On consequent perceptions, white college girls are high on regret (feel sorry you quit, feel dumb talking to others, let parents down) and low on "bad job with more fun" (can't get a good job, work hard for low pay, lost friends' respect, don't have much money, hang around with friends, are more independent, feel older than people in school, are happy you're out).

Significant discrimination was obtained for both antecedents and consequents of FINISHING HIGH SCHOOL. White college girls contrasted with other samples by high scores on "requirements and ingratiation" (do the work you're given, be interested in school work, come to school each day, please the teachers any way you can, get passing grades, get along with teachers, want a good job) and low scores on ambition (want to go to college, be smart, stay out of trouble). White high school boys contrasted with others by high scores on "bad example" (have friends who are dropouts) and low scores on interest in learning (want to learn things, ask for help if needed, study hard).

On consequent perceptions, college girls were low on future obligations (military service, get a job, [negative] feel more mature), while all the high school boys were high. White high school boys were high on independence and freedom (don't have to depend on others, are glad you don't have to listen to teachers any more), while black high school boys were high on social maturity (try to get job training, move into own apartment, are treated better by parents). College girls were also high on personal maturity (go to college, feel proud, plan your future, get married, feel more mature, get respect from others).

Significant differences were found in the perception of the antecedents of JOINING A UNION, but no significant differences existed in the perception of consequents. For antecedent perceptions, the hardcore differed from other samples by scoring low on contract rules (work for a certain time, be in good standing with the company, be able to standup against the company) and on formal conditions (pay your fees, [negative] know somebody in the union, have a job).

Consequent perceptions of all groups were high on direct union benefits and duties (pay dues, get paid vacation, feel safer), moderate on union activities (strike, try to be union officer), job improvements (regular raises, work for improvements, more satisfied with job), and fringe benefits (get along better with boss, work overtime, get union benefits).

Personal Job Evaluation

Significant discrimination was obtained for the antecedents of GETTING A GOOD JOB, but only marginal significance was found for the consequents. White college girls differ from other samples by being high (especially relative to the hardcore) on an ambition factor (be willing to work hard, be sure of yourself, finish high school, have experience, look around at a lot of jobs, know somebody at the company). White high school boys are high on a "support" factor (have a skill, have people to recommend you, go to an employment agency).

For consequent perceptions, college girls are high, and the hardcore subjects are low, on satisfaction and effort (find a better place to live, feel personally satisfied, enjoy working more, work harder). The college girls are high and the white high school bosy are low on ambition (work harder, have more responsibility, are happier, buy things you want most, want to get ahead). Money and effort (open a bank account, have money for things you need, buy things you want most, pay bills, come to work every day, save more money, do best work) was rated high by the college girls, but was not important in discriminating the four samples.

Significant discrimination was also found for the antecedents and consequents of GETTING A BAD JOB. White college girls scored high (relative to the hardcore blacks) on the antecedent of "bad behavior" (act like you don't care about a job, live where there is not much work, have a bad work record); the girls are low on laborer's behavior (be strong, take the first job offered). White high school boys are high and hardcore blacks are low on lack of motivation (be a high school dropout, not look around much, be uninterested in your work) and inexperience (not have worked much, [negative] not know what you want to do).

College girls differ from others in consequent perceptions by scoring high on seeking advancement (quit, look for a better one, [negative] buy more liquor, are bored with the job). The two high school samples see more likelihood of money troubles as a result of a bad job (get low pay, can't buy the things you want most, don't have money for things you need, have to work harder).

On-the-Job Behaviors

The four groups did not differ to a significant extent in their perception of the antecedents of "TO SKIP WORK OR LEAVE EARLY (OFTEN), YOU HAVE TO..." They generally agreed that the opportunity to skip (have friends who will cover for you, have an easy boss) was one of the major antecedents, and dissatisfaction with the job itself and the boss are also relevant. Finally, having more important things to do (e.g., a date) may also lead to this behavior.

In terms of the consequents of this behavior, the male samples perceived skipping as a fun thing to do that has bad consequences, such as getting your pay docked, having a bad reputation. The white samples perceived more guilt as a consequence of this behavior. The white girls also perceived a greater chance of getting fired and losing the boss' respect and other negative outcomes after this behavior.

The four groups have similar perceptions of antecedents to "BEING LATE TO WORK (OFTEN)." They see internal factors such as a person's laziness, lack of dependability, low self-control, and external factors, such as running into heavy traffic and missing your bus as important antecedents. The four groups also do not see any differences in the consequences. The major consequences are trouble with the boss (have a talk with the boss, have your pay docked) and getting a bad reputation. Of lesser importance is the person's attempt to reform himself (e.g., get up earlier in the morning) and his feeling of getting away with something.

The four groups differ significantly on both the antecedents and the consequents of "GOOFING OFF ON THE JOB." The two high school samples see trying to have fun and not caring about the job as important antecedents. The black high school boys see dissatisfaction with the job as leading to goofing off. The consequences seen by the white girls include having a bad reputation and developing a bad reputation, but less likelihood of injury to yourself and others, while the male samples see less of a bad reputation or guilt, but more of a chance to hurt others. The high school boys also see "fun" as one of the consequences, but it was associated with getting fired.

The four groups also differed significantly on the antecedents and consequents-of "GETTING ALONG WITH YOUR BOSS." White high school boys differed from the other samples in that they saw less "Protestant Ethic" behaviors (do good work, be friendly, want to get ahead) and (agreeing with black high school boys) more ingratiating behavior (laugh at his jobs) as required for getting along. In terms of consequences, white high school boys saw more social behavior (go places together, invite to your place) especially in contrast to the college girls; more coworker hostility than other samples (don't get along with other workers); and less job effort and satisfaction (get better working conditions, enjoy work more, do better work) than the other samples. Both white samples saw more help at work and respect (get help with the job, feel he [the boss] respects you) resulting from good relations with the boss than did the black samples.

No significant difference was found in perceptions of the antecedents of "DOING YOUR JOB AS WELL AS YOU CAN," but a significant difference for consequences was observed. All samples (especially college girls) were high on intrinsic motivation antecedents (do careful, neat work; be interested in the work; understand what is expected of you, want to prove your ability); all were likewise low on a factor characterized by the items "do only what you are told" and "help others"; all were again high on "effort and skill" variables (want to do a good job, have good training, work hard).

White college girls differed from other samples in being high on respect and satisfaction consequents (respect self more, feel tired at end of day, enjoy job more) and low on showoff items (make other workers look bad, don't have time for anything else), though black high school students were also high on respect and satisfaction. College girls were also high on achievement items (want to do even better, have a good work record).

Significant differences were found in perceptions of both the antecedents and consequents of "GETTING ALONG WITH OTHER PEOPLE AT WORK." White college girls see helpfulness and consideration (be nice to them, work just as hard as they do, help them if they need it) and sincere behavior (respect others, control your temper, be yourself, do your share of work) as more important than other samples, while ingratiation (play up to the boss, gossip, agree with them, do things together off the job) is seen as less important. Black high school boys see humility (be modest, do things together) as less important than others.

In terms of consequents, black hardcore subjects see less effort and satisfaction (work harder, feel like the time goes faster, get help if you need it, feel respected), less fun (aren't bored, play around during working hours), and a moderate amount of advancement (get ahead faster, get better pay, [negative] make new friends). The white high school boys are highest on the advancement items, but lowest on security (keep the job longer, are happier at home). They are also highest on "better employee" items (don't skip work, work harder) while the black hardcore are lowest.

Proximal Job Consequences

Significant discrimination between samples was obtained for both the antecedents and consequents of QUITTING YOUR JOB. The white college girls (high) contrast with the white high school boys (low) on the antecedent bad job factor (no chance to get ahead, bad working conditions, not do well on job, travel too far to work). College girls were low on laziness as an antecedent of quitting ([negative] get a better job, be lazy, have no ambition), while both the high school samples were high. White college girls (high) contrast with hardcore blacks (low) on advancement factors (not get along with your boss, get a better job, get tired of your job, not like the job). Black high school boys (high) contrast with other samples on payment inequity antecedents (work too hard for the pay you get, get low pay).

In terms of perceived consequences, white college girls (low) are contrasted with white high school boys on "justified quitting with anxiety" (look for another job, feel less safe, take a better job, feel you've done the right thing) and future unemployment (have a bad work record, try to collect welfare, have trouble finding another job). Black hardcore subjects (high) differ from others (low) (especially black high school boys) on "justified quitting without anxiety" (relax, respect yourself more, feel you've done the right thing).

For GETTING A PROMOTION, no differences were obtained on perceived antecedents; differences in the perception of consequents were found, however. All four samples were relatively low on an antecedent "yes man" factor (not talk back to the boss, show you can be a leader), and high on "company man" (do good work, be on time, come each day, show improvement, work hard, show interest, accept more responsibility, do things for company's good) and extra work (be friendly to boss, do extra work, like your work, learn new skills).

On consequent perceptions, hardcore blacks differed from others by being high on respect and ambition (want to get ahead more, demand respect from others, are happier at home) and low on security and future plans (are proud of yourself, accept more responsibility, make plans for the future, feel safer, learn more about the job, get more respect, save more money). Black high school students (high) contrast with other samples, especially the hardcore, on a money and ambition factor (have more money, change your ideas about work, work harder at the new job).

As in the PROMOTION data, no differences were obtained for the antecedents of GETTING A RAISE. Consequent perceptions did differ, however. All groups were high (though the hardcore scored somewhat lower) on the antecedent external pressure (join a union, ask for a raise, be on time every day), a "good worker" factor (come to work every day, do things for the company's good, show leadership ability, be "on the ball"), and an ambition factor (learn new skills, work overtime, stay with the company a certain time, work hard, want to get ahead).

On consequent perceptions, college girls were high and the hardcore were low on ambition (work harder, want to get ahead even more, make your family happy, feel you've done something worthwhile, want to stay with the job, can afford the things you need, are proud of your work). Secondarily, white high school boys are higher than other samples on security and happiness (feel safer, pay some bills, do more things you'd like, are happier at home, enjoy work more) and extra money (buy the things you want most, donate a little to charity).

Significant differences were obtained on both the antecedents and consequents of GETTING FIRED. Whites differ from blacks by virtue of low scores (relative to the black high school boys) on "rule breaking" (come to work drunk, quit work early all the time, disagree with the boss) and high scores (especially relative to the hardcore blacks) on "goldbricking" (disobey boss' orders, not be dependable, goof off on the job, not get along with others) as antecedents of being fired. Hardcore blacks (low) differ from other samples on a "bad worker" factor (do the job badly, be late all the time, be unreliable, not have any ambition), and on carelessness (cause an accident, not understand the job).

On consequents, white college girls differ from other samples (especially the white high school boys) by being relatively low on avoidance of responsibility (try to get welfare, blame it on others, loaf around for awhile, get mad at the boss) along with the black hardcore sample; the college girls and white high school boys are high on "embarrassment with constructive action" (get mad at the boss, worry, feel embarrassed, look for another job, feel treated unfairly, lose self-respect, try to do a better job next time).

Distal Job Consequences

Significant differences were found between groups in the perceptions of both antecedents and consequents of OWNING YOUR OWN HOME. Whites (high) differed from blacks (low) on the antecedents of ambition (sacrifice, want to get ahead, be reliable, have a good job) and available credit (have a car, get a loan). White high school students and black hardcore subjects differed from others in being high on legal maturity (find an agent, be married) and relatively low on financial responsibility (have money for down payment, work hard, have good credit, find an agent, accept more responsibility, have good judgment, find a neighborhood you like and can afford).

White high school boys are high on sacrifice (do without things, invite neighbors over, live there for a long time) as consequences of home ownership;

they and the black hardcore sample are low on security and responsibility (are happy with it, have privacy, feel safe, have more responsibilities).

Significant between-groups differences were found in the perceptions of both the antecedents and consequents of NOT PAYING YOUR BILLS ON TIME. In terms of antecedents, white subjects generally differ from black samples in being low on perceived irresponsibility (lose money gambling, drink too much) and high on unreliability (not get paid on time, forget when they are due, be an unreliable person, not have money on hand, spend money on something else). White college girls contrasted with other samples by scoring moderately high on immaturity (be immature) and lack of planning (not have a budget).

On consequent perceptions, the white samples (especially college girls) scored low on competing gratification (buy some other things you want). Black high school students perceive a greater chance of having a bad credit record (have a bad credit rating, lose respect of others, need a co-signer, lose things you've bought, have a collection agency after you) than other samples.

No significant difference was found on the antecedents of PAYING BILLS ON TIME, but reliable differences in consequent perceptions were found. The four samples were generally high on the antecedent factors of avoidance (not want to get in trouble, plan ahead of time, not want to be in debt) and living within your income (be a dependable person, keep a budget, know when bills are due, want good credit, be mature, appreciate things you're paying for, plan ahead of time). They were lower on conservative buying (have a good job, save money from pay, not run up big bills, pay cash for most things, get a short-term loan).

White college girls differed from others by scoring high on the consequent factor of "no worries" (don't have to worry). The two high school samples scored high on meeting responsibilities (free of debt, get respect from others, have to go without things).

Potential Confrontations with the Legal System

Significant differences were obtained in perceptions of both the antecedents and consequents of "being robbed." The white high school boys were high and the white college girls were low in believing that bravado (be tough, carry a gun or knife, going out of your own neighborhood) leads to being robbed. Black hardcore subjects were low in the belief that showing off (flash money around, have a lot of expensive things, get drunk) leads to being robbed, while they and the white high school boys were both high scorers on the prevention items (have friends, lock your house, carry a gun or knife).

In terms of consequences, the black high school boys were high and the white college girls were low in the belief that being robbed leads to carrying a gun. They agreed, however, that being robbed leads to anger and, to a lesser extent, suspicion of others. The black hardcore subjects were higher than others on the beliefs that being robbed leads to minimizing losses (doctor's treatment, trying to collect on insurance). White high school boys were low on the belief that being robbed leads to increased care (put strong locks on doors, only carry a little money).

No significant differences were found in the perception of the antecedents of "BEING ARRESTED," but such differences did exist in the perception of consequents. The four samples generally agreed that having a bad name and acting guilty (be someplace at the wrong time, get drunk, run from police, have a "bad name" with police), *drug-related acts* (get "high," steal something, not care what you do), and *hanging out* (make a mistake, fight, gamble, be on the corner) lead to arrest, while *coincidence* (be someplace at the wrong time, "look guilty" to a policeman) and *minor violations* (get drunk, be on the corner, break a traffic law) are less likely to have this effect. Some differences did exist, however.

In terms of consequents, black high school students were high on *legal consequences* (go to jail, have a police record, put up bail) and *future bad consequences* (have trouble getting a job, try to tell the police you're innocent, tell friends what happened, are always being watched), while the hardcore blacks were low on these factors. White high school students were high on a "*beating*" factor (get beaten by police, are put on probation) and a *guilt* factor (feel guilty, are embarrassed, make family unhappy) while black hardcore subjects were again low.

Significant differences were found for the antecedents of GETTING DRUNK, but not for the perceived consequents. Black hardcore subjects differed from the other samples, primarily in being low on a "*problems and opportunity*" factor (have a lot of problems, have the money to buy liquor, want to be "cool"). White college girls were contrasted with white high school boys by being high on a *relaxation* factor (work hard that day, be with friends). White high school boys were also low on *excitement* (look for excitement, not know what your limit is), and high on *sadness* ([negative] want to have a good time, have nothing to do the next day, be unhappy about something).

In terms of consequents, subjects generally agreed that drunkenness leads to both *good times* (relax more, feel happy, have a good time, laugh about it with friends the next day) and *bad consequences* (feel sick, get into an accident, feel embarrassed, are hung over the next day, lose others' respect, get arrested, get robbed, miss work). White college girls were high on the former factor and were low on the latter, though the differences were not great.

Significant between-groups differences were found on both the antecedents and consequents of GAMBLING. On antecedents, white high school boys and the hardcore blacks were low on practical considerations (have money, know how to play the games, know where the action is, be willing to take a chance). The white high school boys were lower than all other samples on negative expectancies (not care if you lose, [negative] expect to win). White and black high school students scored similarly high on "uncaring boredom" (not have anything else to do, not care about your family's welfare), contrasting with college girls and hardcore blacks. White college girls and white high school boys (high) contrasted with the black samples (low) (though the main contrast was between college girls and hardcore blacks) on "something for nothing" (be looking for something for nothing).

In terms of consequents, white high school boys were low on toughness (quit while you're ahead, get in with a tough crowd), high on bad family consequences (make family go without things, steal to make up losses, get "hooked" and can't quit) and high on loss of money and friends (lose money, make enemies, [negative] have excitement in your life). White college girls were low on family troubles (argue with your family) and fun and winning (have fun, win a lot of money, have a more exciting life, [negative] have to borrow money). Hardcore blacks were lower than the others on bad consequences to one's self (get hurt if you can't pay, [negative] steal to make up losses).

Significant differences also occurred on the antecedents and consequents of USING DRUGS. On the former, white college girls were high, while white high school boys and hardcore blacks were low on *changing one's life* (be unhappy with life, have friends who use drugs, want new experiences). Both high school samples were low on *experimentation* (have money, have nerve, [negative] be unhappy with life), high on *compensation* (feel inferior, be unhappy with life), and were high on *improvement of life* (not be able to handle problems, want to "find" yourself, want some kicks). White samples (high) were contrasted with black (low), especially hardcore, on *practicality* (know how to use different drugs, have a safe place to take them, have drugs easily available, be curious).

In terms of consequents, white high school boys (and secondarily, hardcore blacks) were high on a *mental improvement* factor (escape from problems, understand things better, improve your life). Both high school samples (especially blacks) were high on a "*head*" factor (get high, try to get others to use them, escape from problems, become unreliable) and a "*bad outcomes*" factor (feel sick, spend all your money on them, lose others' respect).

Significant differences were found for both the antecedents and consequences of STEALING. White high school boys and hardcore blacks were low on *motive and opportunity* (want to make easy money, have the chance to do it). Hardcore blacks were also low on *social pressures* (have friends that steal, have enough nerve, be stupid), but scored moderately on *bravado* (see something you want, want to prove yourself). White college girls scored high on *poverty* (need money) and moderately low (with the hardcore blacks) on *practicalities* (get a gun, have somebody help you, be too lazy to work).

Consequent perceptions differed between white college girls (who scored low) and other samples (high) on bad outcomes (steal again, get set to prison, hide from the police, ruin your chance for a good life). College girls scored high, in contrast to the others, on guilt and fear (feel guilty, lose self-respect, are afraid of getting caught, lose friends' respect). Hardcore blacks scored low, especially with respect to college girls, on loss of others' respect ([negative] steal again, [negative] have the money you need, ruin chance for a good life, make your family feel bad, lose friends' respect). The hardcore sample was also moderately low on bragging (brag about it). White high school boys perceived more likelihood of good outcomes (have the money you need, buy the things you want) from stealing than did the rest.

Aspects of Interpersonal Relations

Significant between-group differences were found for both antecedents and consequents of NOT BEING DEPENDENT ON OTHERS. White high school boys were high on "skills" antecedents relative to other samples (have a skill, believe in self, be a leader, be able to help others, do what you want, don't ask for favors, have own car, have good friends, [negative] have own ideas) and were low on emotional independence (be yourself, have good friends, be proud, have own ideas). White college girls scored higher than other samples on "personal security" (believe in yourself, like yourself, feel safe).

On consequent perceptions all high school students were high on loneliness (sometimes can't get help when you need it, sometimes left out of things, don't have many close friends). Both white samples (high) contrasted with the black samples (slightly lower) on independence (can do your own thing, help others, make own decisions, believe in yourself, [negative] don't have many close friends, accept responsibilities). The same trend was also observed on maturity (have a job, [negative] sometimes can't get help, have personal satisfaction, are mature), though the largest difference was between college girls (high) and hardcore black men (low).

Significant differences were found in the perception of antecedents of BEING RESPECTED AND ADMIRED BY OTHERS, but not for the perceived consequents. On antecedents, white college girls were high compared to other samples on being a good friend (be kind to others, respect yourself, like other people, be willing to help others, be honest, act "cool", but not stuck-up, be thoughtful of others, respect others, be modest, be trustworthy, act friendly, be generous with what you have). The girls were lowest on a better skills factor (do something better than most people can, be smarter than most other people).

For consequents, the four samples generally agreed that respect and admiration leads to more trust from others and security (are a better person, can borrow money easier, feel safer), more help and ambition (can go to others for favors, want to succeed even more), and more pride and responsibility (feel proud, care more about others' feelings, concerned about people, are happy, believe in yourself, want to live up to it, try to help others when they need it). They scored lower on snobbery (get stuck up, aren't free to do anything you want) than other factors.

Significant differences between groups were observed on both the antecedents and consequents of HAVING GOOD FRIENDS. White college girls were contrasted with other groups, especially the white high school boys, by being high on the antecedent respect ([negative] go a lot of places with them, share what you have, respect them) and low on the antecedent of usefulness to others (have money, be smart). All white samples contrasted with all black samples by scoring high on helpful trustworthiness (listen to their ideas, choose friends wisely, go a lot of places with them, keep other's secrets, be smart, do things for them) and dependability (be reliable, be honest, be a good friend, be respected, be loyal, be helpful).

On consequent perceptions, white college girls were contrasted with other samples by being high on fun and mutual help (have someone to help you, do things together, have fun, help them, give things to each other, trust them), "togetherness" (aren't lonely), and pride and security (feel safe, feel good, are proud of yourself, share what you have, are loyal to them). White high school boys (and secondarily, black high school boys) were high on help with forbidden acts (get in trouble together, depend on them).

Significant between-groups discrimination was obtained for the antecedents of HAVING DIGNITY, but only marginal significance occurred for the consequents.

White samples, especially college girls, were contrasted with black samples by being low on social criteria (conform to society, dress well, be well known) and high (college girls only) on internal criteria (respect yourself, be independent, have a good job, respect others, be honorable, be educated). Black high school boys were contrasted with the other samples by their high scores on social criteria and low scores (with the white high school sample) on aloofness (don't show emotion, have money, have a good job). Pride and modesty (stand up for your ideas, believe in yourself, be proud of yourself, be modest) did not prove important, though college girls scored higher than the other samples.

In terms of consequents, black samples were low on concern for others (are good to other people, have respect from others, are polite to everyone, respect others, have a sense of decency). White and black high school boys were high on snobbishness and received hostility (are not liked by some people, get beaten up, act like you are better than others). White college girls and black high school boys were both high on good image (can do what you like, are trusted, are polite to everyone) and pride (try to live up to it, have more self-respect, feel proud, keep your cool, are happy). The differences were generally small, however, and may not be reliable.

Significant discrimination was obtained for both the antecedents and consequents of BUYING A CAR (included here because a car has both interpersonal and job-consequence relevance).

White high school boys contrasted with other samples by scoring high on social and practical factors (want status, have a license, be dependable, get a loan) and (almost equal to the white girls and black high school boys, contrasted with the hardcore) high on financial variables (find a good deal, have money, have a job) as antecedents to ownership. They were low on purely practical antecedents (have good credit rating, shop around for one you like, have a license, be dependable, be able to afford insurance, be old enough to buy one), while the college girls were highest on this factor. Black subjects were high on a necessity factor (need to travel a lot, [negative] have a license, [negative] know how to take care of it).

In terms of consequents, hardcore blacks were low on social success (have people look up to you, take friends around have more fun, impress your girlfriend [boyfriend]) and practical considerations (work hard to pay for it, can get to work easier, keep it in good shape, spend money for gas and oil, learn how to repair it). Both hardcore blacks and college girls were low on show-off behavior (show it off, race it). White college girls (high) and the hardcore (low) were contrasted on responsible driving (drive safely, get insurance, are happy).

Significant discrimination was obtained for both the antecedents and consequents of DOING YOUR OWN THING. White girls contrasted with hardcore blacks by being high on self-actualization and natural interests (have something you like to do, be willing to give up other things, want to express yourself, not be afraid of what others say, be yourself, let it be natural, not forced) while the blacks were low. The reverse was true for "coolness" (be cool) as an antecedent. Black high school students contrasted with other samples by a low score on maturity (make sure you don't hurt anybody, be independent, be mature) and a moderately high score on coolness. White high school boys were low on ability and awareness (learn how to do it well, make the opportunity, know what's happening around you, have friends to help you).

On consequent perceptions, blacks (primarily the hardcore) contrasted with whites by scoring low on self-actualization items (are satisfied with yourself, have purpose in your life, enjoy life more, aren't tied down by society, feel you've done something important, are mature). The hardcore contrasted with all others by scoring low on responsibility (keep trying to make yourself better, are responsible for yourself). White college girls scored lower than all others on a "trouble" factor (get in trouble, ignore society's rules) and moderately low (contrasted with white high school boys, who were high) on independence (have other people putting you down, don't depend on others).

Significant between-groups differences were obtained for the antecedents and consequents of BUYING FINE CLOTHES. White high school boys (high) contrasted with college girls (low) on appearance (be good looking, want to impress people) and, in the reverse direction, on financial and personal factors (have money, know how to budget money, be the kind of person who wears nice things, go to a good store, have pride in the way you look, have good taste, have a job, know what you want before you buy). Black high school boys were similar to the college girls on this factor.

Blacks (high) differed from whites (low, especially college girls) on an "impression" factor (want to impress people, want to impress women, think they will help you get ahead). Blacks were intermediate on social pressure, while white high school students were high and college girls were low (think you are "cool," have friends that dress well, be the kind of person who wears nice things).

On consequent perceptions, black hardcore scored low, compared to other samples, on "good feelings" (take care of them, are happy, look good) and high on sacrifices (save them for special occasions, have to give up other things). White college girls were low on pride and advancement (are proud of yourself, get ahead at work, believe more in yourself). Black high school boys were high on a "good impression" factor (show yourself off, impress people, go to fancy places). White high school students were high on social acceptance, in contrast with other groups (go to fancy places, meet more women [men], get compliments, look respectable).

Significant differences were obtained on both the antecedents and consequents of GETTING A GIRLFRIEND (OR BOYFRIEND). Whites, especially white girls, were high on the antecedent factor of sincerity (be friendly to everyone, respect yourself, be willing to sacrifice for another, respect the other, be yourself). White girls were especially low on the "live" antecedent factor (be "cool"), probably a sex-role difference. White high school boys, as contrasted with other samples, were high on social acceptance (be well-liked, dress well, be good looking) and money (have money, meet a lot of people) and relatively low on showing affection (let him [her] know you're interested, have a good personality, show affection for the other). Hardcore blacks were also low on this factor.

Consequent perceptions differentiating the college girls (high) from other samples were a "feeling good about the relationship" factor (try to treat him [her] well, have someone to help with your problems, feel more confident, are happier, think about marriage, lose some freedom) and a "fun and sex" factor (share experiences, have sex, have more drive, have more fun). Black high school students were also fairly high on the latter factor, while white high school boys were lowest. Both white samples were high on a "worry" factor (worry more, go out more often).

Political Activity

Significant differences were found in the perception of the antecedents of JOINING A MILITANT OR REVOLUTIONARY GROUP, but only marginal differences were found for consequent perceptions.

On antecedents, college girls (high) were contrasted with hardcore blacks (low) on feelings of oppression (believe the militants are right, feel oppressed, have friends in such a group, want to change society). White college girls were low, compared to all others, on followership (have courage, find a group with good leaders, have respect for authority) and immaturity (be immature, not care what happens to you, feel unsure). College girls were high on ideology, also (understand social problems, understand what the group wants, want to help the cause, be willing to fight).

On consequent perceptions, black high school boys (high) contrasted with hardcore men (low) on doubt and danger (wonder if you did the right thing, are in danger, get into fights, get arrested, [negative] learn more about the world). White high school boys (low) were contrasted with college girls (high) on group feeling (feel like you're part of the group, stand up for what you believe); white high school boys were highest on evangelism (don't hear the other side, try to get others to join).

No significant differences were found for either antecedents or consequents of JOINING A DEMONSTRATION. For antecedent perceptions, scores were generally moderate on: ideology (want to change society, not be afraid of arrest, agree with the way the demonstration is run, be angry at some situation or policy); social pressure (want to belong to a group, have friends that are demonstrating); leadership (be a leader, want to convert people, think that you can't get results without it); intellectual agreement (believe in the cause, respect authority, know what's going on, ask questions about the issue). Scores were low on fashionable (join radical organization, think demonstrations are fashionable).

Consequent perceptions showed generally moderate scores on: dedication (feel part of something, learn about the world, ready to demonstrate again, have more self-respect, make new friends, feel proud, work harder for cause than before, try to get others to join); frustration (trouble with parents, feel frustrated, get more respect); scores were lower on acceptance of bad consequences for goals (get arrested, feel you've done something good, lose job, get into a fight, feel part of something).

Discussion

The original focus of the present study was to contrast the social perceptions of a group of hardcore unemployed with several other groups. The results, however, may contain implications broader than this. The extent to which they may generalize to other black samples will be explored in our next study. This study is only exploratory and it must be remembered that we have employed very special samples. The high school boys were judged by school authorities to be socially maladjusted. The hardcore have had a history of job difficulties. Thus, all the blacks in this study were defined by the establishment as "problem people." The contrasting group of white middle-class girls was not judged to have such characteristics.

We extracted a total of 294 factors, each of which could give us some differences across the four groups. If we limit our observations to those instances in which the black groups agree with each other and the white groups agree with each other, we can ask the general question: "Is there a tendency for the blacks, or the whites, to have higher scores (see clearer connections between antecedents and consequences of concepts) in those cases in which the same race samples agree?" We tabulated the 67 instances, out of the total 294 possible, when the same race samples agreed, so that we obtained the frequency of occurances in which the blacks had higher or lower scores than the whites. We found 51 cases when the blacks had lower scores and 16 cases when they had higher scores. If the data were ordered entirely randomly, we would expect one-sixth of the cases, or 49 observations, to conform to each pattern. This is computed by considering that four elements (in this case four samples) can order themselves in 24 different ways, of which four, or one-sixth, meet the conditions described above. Hence, we would expect one-sixth of the observations to show the blacks lower than the whites (and we observed 51 cases instead of the 49 expected by chance) and one-sixth of the observations to show the blacks higher than the whites (we observed only 16 of this type, instead of the expected 49). This difference is significant (by chi-square) at the $p < .001$ level, which means that the blacks have a tendency to see clearer connections than the whites, less frequently than is expected by chance. In other words, although the whites see clearer connections than the blacks as often as is expected by chance, the blacks do not see clearer connections than the whites as frequently as expected by chance. In short, when the blacks agree with each other and the whites agree with each other, the blacks are not likely to see strong connections between antecedents and consequences of events. If we limit our discussion to only the 67 cases when the same race samples agree with each other and differ from the other race, there is a strong tendency (51 out of 67) for the blacks to see weaker links than the whites.

In order to establish which of the two black groups is the one that is producing the lower scores, we considered how frequently each of the four samples had the lowest score on the 294 occasions when the four samples could be compared. If chance alone were operating, we would expect each group to have the lowest score 25% of the time; in fact, only the college girls had this pattern. The hardcore blacks had the lowest score 57% of the time and the high school blacks 10% of the time; the high school whites only 8% of the time. Hence, if we think of these scores as reflections of the extent to which a group perceives a connection between what they do to the environment and what they get from it, we can conclude that the hardcore blacks see little connection between what they do and what they get, while the high school boys, both black and white, see a strong connection. These findings would suggest that the hardcore would also probably be high on Rotter's External Control Scale, but we have no direct evidence on this point.

We now turn our discussion to the more specific findings of the present report.

PRECONDITIONS OF JOB SEEKING. The overall pattern of black-white differences on the antecedents and consequences of these concepts indicates that generally the whites see ambition and social pressure as leading to more EDUCATION and more education as leading to more independence and maturity than do the blacks in our samples. It is conceivable that the blacks sampled here have not developed the concept of ambition to the same extent as the whites, since patterns of behavior that might be classified (by the middle class) as ambitious are generally not reinforced in the ghetto; also, social pressures generally are not likely to push a person to get more education in that setting. Furthermore, independence and maturity may be obtained in the ghetto without much education, so that such consequences of getting more education are less obvious for the blacks, particularly the hardcore sample.

The white samples seem to know more about the preconditions of job seeking, particularly when we note their realistic assessment of the importance of learning a trade and finishing high school before one JOINS A UNION. Blacks, who, of course, have often been excluded from unions on arbitrary or discriminatory grounds, see little connection between such personal accomplishments and joining a union. The benefits of joining a union appear to the blacks to be mostly in the form of monetary fringe benefits.

GOOD AND BAD JOBS. The overall pattern of responses to the antecedents and consequences of good and bad jobs suggests that, in our samples, the whites see more "on the ball" behaviors, such as finishing college, looking at a lot of newspapers, looking around at a lot of jobs, knowing the right people, etc., as leading to GOOD JOBS, than do the blacks; getting a GOOD JOB leads to greater satisfactions and expectations that one would work hard among the whites, but not among the blacks, and getting a BAD JOB leads to less dissatisfaction among the blacks. In short, black perceptions imply less perceived potency to get good jobs and less satisfaction from good jobs. The perceived potency may be a realistic response, but the devaluation of the outcomes appears ego-defensive.

ON-THE-JOB BEHAVIORS. The non-significant differences among the samples in the antecedents and consequences of SKIPPING WORK OR LEAVING EARLY, and BEING LATE FOR WORK, supports the position of those who have argued that blacks are fully aware of what is expected of them in industrial settings, but nevertheless behave differently because they are faced with unpleasant social environments, lack of social support for constructive behavior, etc. In short, the problem is not how to change the amount of information that the blacks have, but how to change the social environment, i.e., the whites.

The significant differences observed on the antecedents and consequences of GOOFING OFF ON YOUR JOB, however, lead to the opposite conclusion. Here we find that the major differences occur between the hardcore and the high school blacks. The hardcore see the antecedents trying to have fun, being dissatisfied, uncaring and lazy as less related to GOOFING OFF, than do the high school blacks. The consequences (a bad reputation) also seem less clear to the hardcore than to the other samples, although this may simply reflect the hardcore's tendency to see weak connections.

The perceptions of interpersonal relationships on the job provide some major differences. Blacks in our samples generally see GETTING ALONG WITH THE BOSS as less likely to lead to getting help on the job and respect from the boss. The hardcore sample sees DOING THE JOB WELL as less likely to lead to achievement, respect, satisfaction and advancement. To GET ALONG

WITH OTHERS on the job, the whites emphasize the need for humility (be modest, do not brag) but the blacks do not. GETTING ALONG WITH OTHERS is perceived by the whites as leading to working harder and not skipping work, but it is not seen as having such consequences by the blacks.

PROXIMAL JOB CONSEQUENCES. A clear trend in both the reactions to on-the-job behaviors and the proximal job consequences, such as is revealed in the antecedents and consequences of QUITTING YOUR JOB, is that the hardcore differ from the other two samples. Thus, we do not really have racial differences in the perception of antecedents and consequences but differences due to setting (ghetto vs. outside ghetto) and job experience. The four samples have rather similar responses to many of the proximal job consequences, such as GETTING A PROMOTION, GETTING A RAISE, etc. One significant difference, however, was found in the consequences of GETTING A RAISE. The black samples do not seem to differ from the white on the economic consequences and the increased ambition that is perceived to follow such an event, but they do see greater satisfaction, happiness, and security to be the consequences of this event. We might speculate that money has a more widespread effect, along a Maslowian hierarchy of need satisfaction, among the blacks than among the whites.

Goldbricking behaviors (goofing off, disobeying the boss, etc.) seem less related to BEING FIRED FROM YOUR JOB among the hardcore than the other three samples. Similarly, carelessness and being a bad worker do not seem to be relevant to such events among this sample. It appears that the hardcore is much more defensive about being fired than the other three samples. On the other hand, this may actually reflect a realistic appraisal of the role of "other factors," such as discrimination on being fired.

DISTAL JOB CONSEQUENCES. Blacks in our samples see less connection between ambition and credit on the one hand, and GETTING YOUR OWN HOUSE, on the other, than do whites. Among blacks the consequences of GETTING YOUR OWN HOUSE include less connection with taking care of the house and independence than is the case among the whites.

Blacks in our samples see gambling and drinking as leading to an INABILITY TO PAY BILLS more strongly than do whites; they also see buying some other thing you want as the most probable outcome of NOT PAYING YOUR BILLS more frequently than do the whites. The hardcore see less clearly than the other samples that living within your income and buying conservatively leads to PAYING YOUR BILLS; to the hardcore, this behavior does not imply meeting your responsibilities to the same extent as it does to the other samples.

To summarize, it appears that the black samples in general, and the hardcore in particular, see fewer connections between what one can do and desirable or undesirable outcomes; furthermore, desirable outcomes do not seem to lead to further desirable outcomes, or to satisfying states of affairs.

POTENTIAL CONFRONTATIONS WITH THE LEGAL SYSTEM. A general trend in these results was the deviance of the hardcore sample from the other three samples. To the extent that these data reflect differences in values it can be concluded that the hardcore is different from the other samples, but that there are no racial differences, as such.

ASPECTS OF INTERPERSONAL RELATIONS. The black samples see less value in NOT BEING DEPENDENT ON OTHERS, since they see less of a chance to do your own thing and be mature as a result of this condition than do whites. Perhaps independence is less of an issue with the black samples. The blacks see less connection than do the whites between things a person does (be kind to others, respect yourself, like other people, be honest, be thoughtful of others, respect other people, be modest, trustworthy) and BEING RESPECTED BY OTHERS. The whites emphasize that in order to HAVE GOOD FRIENDS, one must be trustworthy and dependable to a larger extent than do the blacks. This discrepancy may reflect the different meaning of friend in the two subcultures, since what blacks mean by friend is most similar to what whites call acquaintance. The whites emphasize fun and mutual helping as consequences of HAVING GOOD FRIENDS to a larger extent than the blacks.

The blacks in our samples emphasize the importance of dressing well and being well known in order to HAVE DIGNITY to a larger extent than do the blacks. The blacks stress the importance of being "cool" as an antecedent of DOING YOUR OWN THING to a greater extent than do the whites.

The hardcore is unusually low, relative to the other three samples, in the extent to which they perceive self-actualization and greater responsibility as consequences of DOING YOUR OWN THING. Blacks tend to see that WEARING FINE CLOTHES impresses other people, leads to meeting women and getting compliments to a greater extent than do the whites. The white samples see sincerity as a stronger antecedent of GETTING A GIRLFRIEND (OR BOYFRIEND) than do the blacks. The whites also seem more ambivalent than the blacks about having A GIRLFRIEND, since they see both a greater chance of feeling good about the relationship and worrying about it.

In brief, while these findings are indicative of some differences among our samples of blacks and whites in the way they perceive antecedents and consequences of interpersonal events, the total pattern is quite similar. When differences exist they are mainly in the area of the depth of the relationships that are to be established, with the whites emphasizing more depth. Specifically, whites see sincerity, trustworthiness and openness leading to good outcomes, while blacks emphasize more superficial characteristics, such as clothes, and perceive less ego-involving relationships.

The consistency of these observations with our conclusions from the study of person and role perceptions (Triandis, Feldman & Harvey, 1970, 1971a) is considerable.

POLITICAL ACTIVITIES. It is remarkable that there are no racial differences in the perception of the antecedents and consequences of JOINING A MILITANT OR REVOLUTIONARY GROUP or JOINING A DEMONSTRATION. In our samples, whites and blacks seem to perceive these events within a similar framework. The only exception is that the hardcore sees little connection between feeling oppressed, having friends in militant groups and wanting to change society and JOINING MILITANT GROUPS.

Concluding Discussion

The general trend in the present data suggests some cultural differences across racial lines, but many more differences across the four samples on other bases. This might have been expected, for the reader is reminded that although we have chosen to organize much of our analysis and discussion of the results in a way that will spotlight black-white differences, our design seriously limits the generalizability of our findings. We have sampled but two of the many possible subgroups to be found in the black ghetto. Likewise, our white samples are hardly representative of the "silent majority." The inclusion of a female sample that is much better educated further confounds matters. Nevertheless, it is possible to gain some insights and leads for a more exhaustive study in this area.

The racial differences that emerge are primarily due to the hardcore sample, which seems to be behaving in a rather defensive manner, reflecting the uncertainty and discrimination it has experienced in an environment in which it lacks potency. There is ample evidence that the hardcore sample sees little connection between what one does and what one gets from the environment. The situation being what it is lends considerable reality support to this perception of low potency. Moreover, while there is the suggestion that rehabilitation procedures which help establish feelings of potency are in order, we must also develop ways of modifying the environment. Put another way, the fact that there are differences between the hardcore and the other groups (particularly the whites) on the perception of antecedents and consequences of concepts implies that the basic assumption underlying most training programs for the hardcore should be re-evaluated.

The assumption that the behavior of the trainees must be shaped so as to be more acceptable to those people already in the job setting appears cogent from the white frame of reference. Many blacks vigorously object to the ethnocentrism thereby implied. Their objection is only in part due to their suspicions that the assumption is not valid. The heart of the matter is that this approach requires a unilateral accomodation. It appears just as logical to modify the behavior and attitudes of those already in the work situation. Indeed, some of the findings of the present study would suggest this to be an easier approach (see also Triandis & Malpass, 1971).

References

Fishbein, M. A behavior theory approach to the relations between beliefs about an object and the attitude toward the object. In M. Fishbein (Ed.), Readings in attitude theory and measurement. New York: Wiley, 1967, 389-400.

Haried, A. The semantic problem of external accounting communication. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Illinois, 1969.

Harris, C. W., & Kaiser, H. F. Oblique factor analytic solutions by orthogonal transformations. Psychometrika, 1964, 29, 347-362.

Peak, H. Attitude and motivation. In M. R. Jones (Ed.), Nebraska symposium on motivation: 1955. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1955, 149-189.

Rosenberg, M. J. Cognitive structure and attitudinal affect. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1956, 53, 367-372.

Triandis, H. C., Feldman, J. M., & Harvey, W. M. Person perception among black and white adolescents and the hardcore unemployed. Report No. 5, SRS No. 12-P-55175/5-02. Champaign, Ill.: Department of Psychology, University of Illinois, 1970.

Triandis, H. C., Feldman, J. M., & Harvey, W. M. Role perceptions among black and white adolescents and the hardcore unemployed. Report No. 6, SRS No. 12-P-55175/5-02. Champaign, Ill.: Department of Psychology, University of Illinois, 1971. (a)

Triandis, H. C., Kilty, K., Shanmugam, A., Tanaka, Y., & Vassiliou, V. Cognitive structures and the analysis of values. In H. Triandis, V. Vassiliou, Y. Tanaka, and A. Shanmugam, (Eds.), The analysis of subjective culture. New York: Wiley, 1971.

Triandis, H. C., & Malpass, R. S. Studies of black and white interaction in job settings. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 1971.

Triandis, H. C., & Vassiliou, V. A comparative analysis of subjective culture. In H. Triandis, V. Vassiliou, Y. Tanaka and A. Shanmugam (Eds.), The analysis of subjective culture. New York: Wiley, 1971.

Vroom, V. H. Work and motivation. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1964.

Werner, O., & Campbell, D. T. Translating, working through interpreters and the problem of decentering. In R. Naroll and R. Cohen (Eds.), A handbook of method in cultural anthropology. New York: American Museum of Natural History, 1970.

APPENDIX

LEGEND FOR APPENDICES

In the appendices that follow, the antecedents of the concepts under study appear in the first table, under the title which indicates what concept is being studied. For example, Table 1 reports the antecedents of To Finish College. The factor correlation matrix shows the extent to which people who give high responses to one factor also give high responses to other factors. The Group Means on the Original Factor Scores refers to the way our four samples responded on each of the factors, on the average. The code is as follows:

Group 1 = Middle-class females (white)
Group 2 = Lower-class high school boys (white)
Group 3 = Lower-class high school boys (black)
Group 4 = Hardcore unemployed (black)

The discriminant function tables show the loadings of the obtained factors on the discriminant functions. Finally, the Group Means on the Discriminant Functions section shows the way each of the four groups responded on the average, on the extracted discriminant functions--i.e., a new variable that reflects how they responded to each factor weighted by the loading on the discriminant functions.

The same pattern is used for the consequents, except that the concept whose consequents are studied is followed by three dots, e.g., "If you finish college, you..."

PRECONDITIONS FOR JOB-SEEKING

Table 1

Finish College

Items	Rotated Factor Matrix		
	I	II	III
Be willing to work	1.58*	0.25	0.11
Have drive	0.98	1.58*	-0.84
Go to classes	2.00*	-0.27	0.08
Study hard	2.05*	-0.16	-0.13
Know what you want to do	1.48*	0.43	-0.15
Have friends in college	-0.62	1.97*	0.39
Be interested in (dig) what you are doing	1.45*	0.46	-0.06
Have the right attitude	1.69*	0.05	0.11
Do the work the teachers assign	1.96*	-0.61	0.39
Be smart	0.30	0.62	1.35*
Have money	-0.11	-0.13	2.11*
Want to "live good"	0.10	0.57	1.25*
Want to learn	2.16*	-0.38	-0.03
Believe in yourself	1.87*	0.29	-0.40
Get along with the teachers	0.96	0.10	0.90

I. Work and confidence

II. Ambition--social pressure

III. Financial incentive--capability

Factor Correlation Matrix

	1	2
1		
2	0.95	
3	0.95	0.93

* Highest factor loadings

Table 1 (Continued)

Group Means on Original Factor Scores

Group	1	2	3
1	3.92	3.39	2.96
2	3.67	3.29	3.61
3	4.30	2.22	3.37
4	3.23	3.06	2.84

Discriminant Functions

Factors	Function 1	Function 2
1	0.9164	-0.4170
2	-0.3632	-0.0151
3	0.1683	-0.9088
4		
5		
6		
% of Variance	71.3	26.5

Group Means on Discriminant Functions

Group	Function 1	Function 2
1	2.86	-1.11
2	2.77	-1.80
3	3.34	-1.32
4	2.33	-1.28

Overall F-ratio 3.18 (df = 9, 226) $p < .01$

Table 2

"If you finish college, you..."

Items	I	II	III
Get a good job	1.89*	-0.25	0.49
Work harder	1.41*	0.18	0.35
Get better pay	2.21*	0.29	-0.47
Feel important	1.31*	0.83	-0.14
Get married	0.03	2.05*	-0.12
Don't have to depend on others	-0.24	1.82*	0.42
Have some of the "finer things in life" ("live good")	1.06*	0.53	0.58
Get more education (law school, medical school)	1.32*	-0.58	1.53*
Go into military service (Army, Navy, etc.)	-0.45	0.22	2.42*
Feel that you've accomplished something	2.18*	-0.53	0.40
Get respect from other people	2.08*	-0.02	-0.20
Plan for the future	2.33*	-0.17	-0.18
Move into your own apartment	2.17*	0.13	-0.41
Have your parents treat you better	1.38*	0.44	0.10
Believe in yourself	2.46*	-0.05	-0.38

1. Accomplishment
2. Independence
3. Future obligations

Factor Correlation Matrix

	1	2
1		
2	0.94	
3	0.92	0.91

*Highest factor loadings

Table 2 (Continued)

Group Means on Original Factor Scores

Group	1	2	3
1	3.57	3.39	2.13
2	3.32	3.22	2.96
3	3.48	2.72	2.68
4	3.06	2.92	2.31

Discriminant Functions

Factors	Function 1	Function 2	Function 3
1	0.3069	-0.9865	0.3518
2	-0.5710	-0.1387	-0.7634
3	0.7614	0.0876	-0.5417
4			
5			
6			
% of Variance	49.7	32.5	17.8

Group Means on Discriminant Functions

Group	Function 1	Function 2	Function 3
1	0.78	-3.80	-2.49
2	1.43	-3.47	-2.89
3	1.56	-3.58	-2.30
4	1.03	-3.22	-2.40

Overall F-ratio 2.94 (df = 9, 222) $p < .01$

Table 3

"To not finish high school, you have to..."

Items	Rotated Factor Matrix					
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI
Dislike the teachers	0.16	0.09	-0.04	0.11	1.60*	-0.05
Have a poor family	-0.41	-0.03	0.02	0.02	2.34*	0.34
Be expelled ("kicked out")	0.98	0.29	-0.46	0.23	0.72	-0.78
Be lazy	0.89	-0.11	0.40	-0.46	1.07*	-0.66
Think only of the present	1.09*	0.05	0.22	-0.04	0.59	-0.39
Not have friends in school	0.44	0.26	0.26	0.28	0.39	1.82*
Get bad grades	1.94*	-0.02	0.05	0.17	-0.60	0.51
Have no goals	0.19	0.08	1.98*	-0.75	0.03	0.63
Feel like a failure in school	0.40	-0.95	1.64*	0.33	-0.12	0.05
Skip classes	0.19	-0.08	0.70	1.04*	-0.13	-0.86
Find a job that looks good	-0.15	-0.16	+0.00	1.93*	0.20	0.22
Get in trouble in school	0.27	0.22	-0.21	1.86*	-0.16	0.15
Have no ambition	0.38	1.10*	0.98	-0.15	-0.53	-0.60
Not have anybody to help you with your problems	-1.04*	0.36	1.73*	0.56	0.24	-0.36
Be dumb	-0.04	2.20*	-0.04	0.05	0.05	0.21

1. Bad student
2. Motivation
3. Personal problems
4. Discipline problem
5. Poverty
6. Social isolation

Factor Correlation Matrix

	1	2	3	4	5	6
1						
2	0.89					
3	0.95	0.89				
4	0.93	0.89	0.93			
5	0.92	0.88	0.90	0.90		
6	0.15	0.09	0.13	0.09	0.16	

*Highest factor loadings

Table 3 (Continued)

Group Means on Original Factor Scores

Group	1	2	3	4	5	6
1	4.39	1.87	4.28	3.56	2.74	-0.14
2	3.59	2.33	3.22	2.84	2.77	0.24
3	4.13	2.54	3.63	3.27	2.73	0.21
4	2.89	1.87	3.18	2.39	2.25	0.24

Discriminant Functions

Factors	Function 1	Function 2
1	0.7759	-0.2353
2	-0.2370	-0.6784
3	-0.0819	0.6420
4	0.5546	0.0087
5	-0.1429	0.0161
6	-0.0847	-0.2682
% of Variance	68.2	29.2

Group Means on Discriminant Functions

Group	Function 1	Function 2
1	4.20	0.56
2	3.13	-0.35
3	3.71	-0.35
4	2.52	0.09

Overall F-ratio 2.15 (df = 18, 258) $p < .01$

Table 4

"If you don't finish school, you..."

Items	Rotated Factor Matrix		
	I	II	III
Can't get a good job	-0.28	0.30	1.65*
Work hard for low pay	-0.14	0.97	1.06*
Lose your friends' respect	0.47	0.02	1.09*
Don't have much money	0.31	0.56	0.94
Can't get ahead	0.86	0.20	0.79
Hang around with your friends	0.90	+0.00	1.03*
Don't have to do school work	2.72*	-0.27	-0.29
Try to go to night school	1.69*	0.87	-0.46
Get married	1.57*	0.46	-0.04
Are more independent	1.14*	-1.27*	1.74*
Feel older (more grown-up) than people in school	-1.01*	0.07	2.51*
Feel sorry you quit	-0.08	1.84*	0.37
Feel dumb when talking to others	0.08	1.40*	0.40
Are happy you're out	0.24	-0.30	1.63*
Let your parents down	0.02	2.35*	-0.26

1. Escape
2. Regret
3. Bad job with more fun

Factor Correlation Matrix

	1	2
1		
2	0.92	
3	0.93	0.93

*Highest factor loadings

Table 4 (Continued)

Group Means on Original Factor Scores

Group	1	2	3
1	3.18	3.56	2.75
2	2.93	2.57	3.21
3	2.66	2.93	3.36
4	2.73	2.66	2.98

Discriminant Functions

Factors	Function 1	Function 2
1	0.3007	-0.4703
2	0.6935	0.6160
3	-0.6547	0.6319

Group Means on Discriminant Functions

Groups	Function 1	Function 2
1	1.62	2.43
2	0.56	2.23
3	0.63	2.68
4	0.72	2.24

Overall F-ratio 3.23 (df = 9, 222) $p < .01$

Table 5

To Finish High School

Items	Rotated Factor Matrix			
	I	II	III	IV
Do the work you are given	-0.25	-0.57	0.41	1.73*
Want to go to college	-0.37	0.17	1.77*	0.14
Be interested in your school work	-0.12	-0.56	0.73	1.15*
Come to school each day--if you can	-0.22	-0.02	-0.28	1.59*
Please the teachers any way you can	-0.81	0.72	0.65	1.21*
Get passing grades	-0.02	0.18	-0.38	1.97*
Be smart	0.74	-0.05	1.53*	-0.47
Stay out of trouble	0.41	0.16	1.24*	0.11
Want to finish	0.41	-0.05	0.41	0.18
Want to learn things	2.13*	0.13	0.22	-0.43
Ask for help if you need it	1.62*	0.27	-0.54	0.48
Study hard	1.57*	-0.35	0.07	0.27
Get along with teachers all right	0.02	0.09	0.15	1.29*
Want a good job	0.85	0.26	-0.61	1.19*
Have friends who are dropouts	0.04	2.66*	0.04	-0.01

1. Interest in learning
2. Bad example
3. Ambition
4. Requirements and ingratiation

Factor Correlation Matrix

	1	2	3	4
1				
2	0.78			
3	0.94	0.82		
4	0.96	0.82	0.95	

*Highest factor loadings

Table 5 (Continued)

Group Means on Original Factor Scores

Group	1	2	3	4
1	3.45	1.01	2.67	4.60
2	3.03	1.75	3.40	3.97
3	3.52	1.56	3.50	4.24
4	3.41	1.53	3.45	3.84

Discriminant Functions

Factor	Function 1	Function 2	Function 3
1	-0.0732	0.7665	-0.3388
2	-0.3118	-0.4047	-0.5288
3	-0.6299	-0.0008	-0.3240
4	0.7076	-0.4986	-0.7076
5			
6			
% of Variance	82.2	13.2	4.6

Group Means on Discriminant Functions

Group	Function 1	Function 2	Function 3
1	1.00	-0.06	-5.82
2	-0.09	-0.37	-5.86
3	0.05	-0.05	-6.16
4	-0.18	0.08	-5.80

Overall F-ratio 1.94 (df = 12, 246) $p < .05$

Table 6

"If you finish high school, you..."

	Rotated Factor Matrix			
Items	I	II	III	IV
Get a job	0.67	1.11*	-0.24	0.32
Go into military service	-0.10	2.00*	-0.06	-0.24
Go to college	1.39*	0.62	-0.03	-0.16
Buy a car	0.59	0.63	-0.22	0.59
Feel proud of yourself	1.33*	0.22	-0.68	0.68
Start planning your future	2.06*	0.12	-0.31	-0.08
Get married	1.13*	0.33	0.85	-0.69
Feel more mature (grown-up)	1.76*	-0.99	0.21	0.63
Get respect from others	1.79*	-0.23	0.78	-0.44
Don't have to depend on others	0.12	-0.20	2.05*	-0.07
Are just lazy for a while	-0.29	0.79	0.79	0.46
Are glad you don't have to listen to teachers any more	-0.48	0.53	1.15*	0.81
Try to get some job training	0.19	0.29	-0.32	1.48*
Move into your own apartment	-0.39	0.09	0.63	1.43*
Are treated better by your parents	0.07	-0.44	-0.07	2.06*

1. Personal maturity
2. Future obligations
3. Independence--freedom
4. Social maturity

Factor Correlation Matrix

	1	2	3	4
1				
2	0.95			
3	0.92	0.92		
4	0.95	0.94	0.93	

*Highest factor loadings

Table 6 (Continued)

Group Means on Original Factor Scores

Group	1	2	3	4
1	3.80	2.61	2.02	3.40
2	3.82	3.29	3.23	3.51
3	3.73	3.87	3.06	4.18
4	3.35	3.15	2.26	3.50

Discriminant Functions

Factors	Function 1	Function 2	Function 3
1	-0.4548	-0.3772	-0.7389
2	0.6717	0.3257	0.2462
3	0.4787	-0.6937	0.2153
4	0.3359	0.5200	-0.5891
5			
6			
% of Variance	71.5	22.2	6.30

Group Means on Discriminant Functions

Group	Function 1	Function 2	Function 3
1	2.13	-0.22	-3.73
2	3.20	-0.78	-3.39
3	3.77	-0.09	-3.60
4	2.85	0.01	-3.27

Overall F-ratio 3.92 (df = 12, 238) $p < .01$

Table 7

"To join a union, you have to..."

Items	Rotated Factor Matrix I	II	III	IV	V	VI
Work for a certain time	2.58*	0.08	-0.02	-0.38	-0.04	-0.11
Be in good standing with the company	1.30*	-0.69	0.16	0.96	-0.24	0.32
Be able to stand up against the company	0.94	0.18	-0.23	0.46	0.17	0.47
Pay your fees to the union	0.73	-0.54	0.49	0.71	1.06*	-0.25
Learn a trade	-0.61	+0.00	0.34	1.70*	0.66	-0.23
Finish high school	-0.27	-0.03	-0.25	2.17*	-0.11	0.13
Be willing to go on strike	0.55	1.56*	-0.41	-0.10	0.79	-0.13
Know somebody in the union	0.44	1.51*	0.03	0.96	-1.20*	0.13
Not want to be laid off	-0.25	2.26*	0.46	-0.19	0.21	0.04
Have a job	-0.07	0.32	-0.17	0.14	2.27*	0.01
Not trust the company	0.01	0.60	-0.[illegible]	-0.13	0.36	1.89*
Be trained by an older man	-0.10	-0.35	0.43	0.17	-0.34	2.08*
Believe in the union's leaders	-0.02	-0.47	1.61*	-0.52	0.80	0.92
Want to get along with others at work	-0.30	0.47	2.21*	0.05	-0.44	0.09
Be willing to work for the union	0.46	0.14	1.93*	0.08	0.02	-0.57

1. Contract rules
2. Security
3. Social pressure
4. Practicality
5. Formal conditions
6. Pro-union beliefs

Factor Correlation Matrix

	1	2	3	4	5	6
1						
2	0.88					
3	0.92	0.88				
4	0.93	0.91	0.92			
5	0.90	0.89	0.89	0.91		
6	0.89	0.88	0.88	0.89	0.85	

---

*Highest factor loadings

Table 7 (Continued)

Group Means on Original Factor Scores

Group	1	2	3	4	5	6
1	3.02	2.42	2.80	3.86	3.47	1.95
2	3.06	2.72	2.91	3.45	2.28	2.52
3	3.49	2.62	2.99	3.26	2.83	2.50
4	2.41	2.24	2.52	2.97	1.90	1.97

Discriminant Functions

Factors	Function 1	Function 2	Function 3
1	0.5516	-0.5145	0.2604
2	-0.0796	-0.3439	-0.2896
3	-0.0002	-0.2260	-0.0768
4	-0.1241	0.4636	-0.8428
5	0.8206	0.4524	0.2853
6	-0.0244	-0.3824	-0.2253
% of Variance	63.1	31.6	5.31

Group Means on Discriminant Functions

Group	Function 1	Function 2	Function 3
1	3.79	-0.41	-2.83
2	2.85	-1.50	-3.04
3	3.57	-1.54	-2.59
4	2.30	-1.09	-2.61

Overall F-ratio 2.77 (df = 18, 258) $p < .01$

Table 8

"If you join a union, you..."

Items	Rotated Factor Matrix I	II	III	IV
Pay dues	0.10	-0.15	1.95*	-0.09
Get vacation with pay	-0.22	0.13	2.07*	-0.40
Feel safer	-0.11	-0.22	1.76*	0.15
Go out on strike	1.81*	-0.78	0.57	0.05
Go to the union meetings	0.82	0.06	0.87	0.02
Get better working conditions	0.18	0.40	0.66	0.66
Feel like part of a group	-0.11	0.60	0.60	0.74
Get regular raises	0.18	1.15*	0.43	0.01
Work for improvements on the job	-0.25	2.22*	-0.07	-0.05
Are more satisfied with the job	0.55	1.59*	-0.10	-0.17
Try to be a union officer	1.94*	0.50	-0.64	-0.04
Feel you are protected against being fired	-0.07	0.26	0.66	0.80
Get along better with the boss	-0.24	0.01	-0.19	2.07*
Work overtime	0.31	-0.30	-0.36	2.07*
Get union benefits (retirement, sick pay, etc.)	-0.07	0.09	0.20	1.03*

1. Union activities
2. Job improvement
3. Direct union benefits and duties
4. Fringe benefits

Factor Correlation Matrix

	1	2	3	4
1				
2	0.94			
3	0.95	0.95		
4	0.94	0.93	0.95	

---

*Highest factor loadings

Table 8 (Continued)

Group Means on Original FactorsScores

Group	1	2	3	4
1	3.18	3.61	4.41	3.22
2	3.24	3.32	3.47	3.27
3	3.43	3.41	4.31	3.42
4	3.28	3.46	3.80	3.44

Discriminant Functions

Factors	Function 1	Function 2
1	-0.1513	-0.6290
2	-0.2105	0.6219
3	0.9081	-0.0636
4	-0.3288	-0.4621
5		
6		
% of Variance	84.4	12.3

Group Means on Discriminant Functions

Group	Function 1	Function 2
1	1.71	-1.52
2	0.89	-1.70
3	1.55	-1.89
4	1.09	-1.74

Overall F-ratio 1.18 (df = 12, 241) N/S

PERSONAL JOB EVALUATION

Table 9

"To get a good job you have to..."

Items	Rotated Factor Matrix I	II	III
Have a skill	-0.17	0.07	1.83*
Have people to recommend (say good things about) you	0.11	-0.00	1.54*
Go to an employment agency	0.41	-0.17	1.37*
Be willing to work hard	-0.70	1.41*	0.74
Be sure of yourself	-0.28	1.50*	0.29
Finish high school	+0.00	1.55*	-0.12
Have experience	0.19	1.26*	-0.05
Be smart	0.44	0.71	0.40
Look in a newspaper	1.08*	+0.00	0.53
Show the right attitude	-0.03	1.64*	-0.14
Finish college	1.95*	-0.32	-0.02
Be interested ("moved" by) the job	1.25*	0.14	0.31
Look around at a lot of jobs	1.19*	1.06*	-0.80
Have ambition (want to get ahead)	0.05	1.61*	-0.24
Know somebody at the company	1.25*	0.07	0.04

1.

2. Ambition

3. Support for application

Factor Correlation Matrix

	1	2	3
1			
2	0.96		
3	0.95	0.96	

*Highest factor loadings

Table 9 (Continued)

Group Means on Original Factor Scores

Group	1	2	3
1	3.77	5.20	3.67
2	4.07	4.59	4.09
3	3.67	4.69	3.89
4	3.43	3.97	3.22

Discriminant Functions

Factors	Function 1	Function 2	Function 3
1	-0.3641	0.4053	0.8102
2	0.9305	-0.4708	0.0834
3	-0.0387	0.7836	-0.5803
4			
5			
6			
% of Variance	56.7	38.6	4.6

Group Means on Discriminant Functions

Group	Function 1	Function 2	Function 3
1	3.33	1.95	1.36
2	2.63	2.69	1.31
3	2.88	2.33	1.10
4	2.32	2.05	1.24

Overall F-ratio 2.26 (df = 9, 229) $p < .05$

Table 10

"If you get a good job, you..."

Items	I	II	III
Open a bank account	-0.14	1.05*	0.50
Feel safe	-0.21	0.88	0.78
Have money for things you need ((food, place to live)	0.08	1.05*	0.29
Find a better place to live	1.37*	0.66	-0.43
Feel personally satisfied	1.87*	0.14	-0.17
Enjoy working more	1.65*	-0.25	0.46
Work harder	1.07*	-0.55	1.23*
Have more responsibility	-0.15	-0.22	1.89*
Are happier	0.12	0.39	1.02*
Buy things you want most	-0.83	1.09*	1.01*
Pay your bills	-0.30	1.46*	0.19
Come to work every day	0.03	1.69*	-0.37
Save more money	0.43	1.58*	-0.58
Do your best work	0.53	1.14*	-0.16
Want to get ahead	0.38	-0.04	1.22*

1. Satisfaction and effort
2. Money and effort
3. Ambition

Factor Correlation Matrix

	1	2	3
1			
2	0.96		
3	0.96	0.97	

*Highest factor loadings

Table 10 (Continued)

Group Means on Original Factor Scores

Group	1	2	3
1	4.39	5.36	5.05
2	3.80	4.76	3.95
3	3.70	4.96	4.36
4	3.31	4.53	4.06

Discriminant Functions

Factors	Function 1	Function 2
1	0.8176	-0.5841
2	0.2716	-0.2345
3	0.5076	0.7771
4		
5		
6		
% of Variance	77.7	18.8

Group Means on Discriminant Functions

Group	Function 1	Function 2
1	7.61	0.10
2	6.41	-0.27
3	6.59	0.06
4	6.00	0.16

Overall F-ratio 1.70 (df = 9, 222) .10> p > .05

Table 11

"To get a bad job, you have to..."

Items	Rotated Factor Matrix I	II	III	IV	V	VI
Be lazy	0.23	-0.05	-0.09	0.05	0.06	1.95*
Be unskilled	-0.09	-0.33	0.81	0.81	0.11	0.91
Be a high school dropout	-0.05	-0.26	1.71*	0.03	-0.30	0.35
Not look around much	-0.33	-0.32	2.05*	0.01	0.19	-0.35
Be uninterested (not moved by) in your work	0.63	0.61	1.11*	-0.21	-0.59	0.03
Be unintelligent (dumb)	0.63	1.04	0.63	0.06	-0.81	0.21
Act like you don't care about a job	2.03*	-0.03	-0.53	-0.41	-0.06	0.58
Live someplace where there is not much work	1.31*	-0.51	0.40	0.30	0.38	-0.32
Have a bad work record	1.48*	0.09	0.36	0.38	0.25	-0.93
Be strong	-0.07	2.41*	-0.28	0.33	-0.07	-0.11
Not have worked much	-0.17	0.50	0.04	1.90*	0.26	0.04
Not want to get ahead	0.16	-0.27	-0.14	0.40	1.93*	-0.00
Be fired from another job	0.32	0.30	0.03	0.01	1.03*	0.23
Take the first job offered	-0.26	1.08*	0.35	-0.61	0.93	0.21
Not know what you want to do	-0.15	0.55	0.74	-0.96	1.13*	0.07

1. Bad behavior
2. Laborer's behavior
3. No motivation
4. Inexperience
5. No ambition
6. Laziness

Factor Correlation Matrix

	1	2	3	4	5	6
1						
2	0.88					
3	0.95	0.90				
4	0.86	0.85	0.86			
5	0.91	0.91	0.91	0.86		
6	0.90	0.84	0.93	0.81	0.86	

---

*Highest factor loadings

Table 11 (Continued)

Group Means on Original Factor Scores

Group	1	2	3	4	5	6
1	3.79	1.80	3.96	1.57	2.61	2.21
2	3.16	2.78	4.36	2.17	2.82	2.81
3	3.75	2.52	4.03	2.11	2.84	2.67
4	2.42	2.30	3.03	1.55	2.41	1.72

Discriminant Functions

Factors	Function 1	Function 2	Function 3
1	0.8371	-0.2747	-0.3617
2	-0.5037	0.2387	-0.3843
3	-0.1060	0.5842	0.7678
4	-0.1442	0.5523	-0.2158
5	-0.0188	-0.1727	0.0606
6	-0.1152	0.4375	-0.2860
% of Variance	51.6	40.8	7.55

Group Means on Discriminant Functions

Group	Function 1	Function 2	Function 3
1	1.32	3.08	0.17
2	0.09	4.29	0.04
3	0.77	3.77	-0.28
4	0.08	2.85	-0.12

Overall F-ratio 2.22 (df = 18, 258) $p < .01$

Table 12

"If you get a bad job, you..."

	Rotated Factor Matrix			
Items	I	II	III	IV
Quit	0.12	1.33*	0.49	0.07
Look for a better one	-0.15	2.34*	-0.05	0.22
Get low pay	0.25	0.84	-0.31	1.04*
Can't buy the things you want most	0.48	0.37	-0.38	1.34*
Don't have money for the things you need (food, place to live, etc.)	0.35	-0.58	0.16	1.74*
Have to work harder	-0.68	0.77	0.18	1.67*
Buy more liquor	-0.20	-1.30*	1.72*	0.97
Don't enjoy your work	-0.33	0.34	2.03*	-0.02
Don't do your best work	0.38	0.17	1.76*	-0.41
Skip work often	0.86	0.29	0.93	-0.49
Are bored with the job	0.54	1.20*	0.66	-0.34
Don't get along with the boss	1.80*	0.29	-0.11	-0.32
Make excuses to your friends	1.50*	-0.21	-0.20	0.40
Don't care if you get ahead or not	1.47*	-0.44	0.09	0.43
Aren't happy at home	1.71*	-0.07	-0.10	-0.04

1. Dissatisfaction
2. Seek advancement
3. Bad worker
4. Money troubles

Factor Correlation Matrix

	1	2	3	4
1				
2	0.93			
3	0.94	0.91		
4	0.94	0.93	0.94	

*Highest factor loadings

Table 12 (Continued)

Group Means on Original Factor Scores

Group	1	2	3	4
1	3.92	3.62	3.46	2.93
2	3.74	2.71	3.18	3.46
3	3.51	3.08	3.36	3.64
4	2.87	2.39	3.03	3.05

Discriminant Functions

Factors	Function 1	Function 2	Function 3
1	0.3582	-0.2485	-0.7508
2	0.8386	0.0676	0.4863
3	0.1253	0.2028	0.3686
4	-0.3908	-0.9448	0.2528
5			
6			
% of Variance	68.9	22.4	8.71

Group Means on Discriminant Functions

Group	Function 1	Function 2	Function 3
1	3.73	-2.79	0.84
2	2.66	-3.37	0.56
3	2.84	-3.42	1.02
4	2.22	-2.82	0.90

Overall F-ratio 3.35 (df = 12, 236) $p < .01$

ON-THE-JOB BEHAVIOR

Table 13

"To skip work or leave early (often), you have to..."

Items	I	II	III	IV	V
Be lazy	-0.07	-0.01	0.05	2.08*	0.13
Be sick	0.53	0.57	0.24	1.24*	-0.70
Be tired of work	0.11	-0.06	-0.25	0.07	1.77*
Not like the job	0.02	0.10	0.04	0.05	1.55*
Not like the boss	-0.06	0.40	-0.10	-0.28	1.68*
Have a date	0.43	0.73	1.02*	-1.09*	0.18
Not care if you get fired	0.41	-0.50	0.59	0.32	1.16*
Be looking for another job	2.06*	0.07	-0.06	-0.09	-0.03
Not like the people you work with	1.23*	-0.41	-0.07	0.35	0.81
Have friends who will cover for you	0.06	1.93*	-0.55	0.00	0.01
Have an easy boss	-0.35	1.22*	0.26	+0.00	0.44
Not be a dependable person	-0.47	0.89	0.27	0.55	0.47
Finish your work early	0.76	0.96	0.68	0.01	-0.64
Not care if you lose some pay	-0.69	0.03	1.63*	0.34	0.44
Have something more important to do	0.13	-0.35	2.18*	-0.08	-0.28

1. Dissatisfaction with coworkers
2. Opportunity
3. Other affairs
4. Lazy
5. Dissatisfaction with job and boss

Factor Correlation Matrix

	1	2	3	4	5
1					
2	0.92				
3	0.92	0.94			
4	0.88	0.90	0.89		
5	0.92	0.94	0.92	[illegible]	

*Highest factor loadings

Table 13 (Continued)

Group Means on Original Factor Scores

Group	1	2	3	4	5
1	2.98	3.47	3.44	2.61	3.06
2	2.77	3.69	3.02	2.43	3.48
3	2.75	3.61	3.37	2.44	3.34
4	2.96	2.95	2.71	1.91	2.86

Discriminant Functions

Factors	Function 1	Function 2
1	-0.7510	-0.2314
2	0.3478	0.3473
3	0.4141	-0.6813
4	0.3314	-0.2846
5	0.1839	0.5298
6		
% of Variance	72.7	24.1

Group Means on Discriminant Functions

Group	Function 1	Function 2
1	1.82	-0.95
2	1.90	-0.26
3	2.01	-0.60
4	1.08	-0.53

Overall F-ratio 1.26 (df = 15, 252) N/S

Table 14

"If you skip work or leave early (often), you..."

Items	Rotated Factor Matrix I	II	III	IV
Feel guilty	-0.25	0.03	0.33	1.73*
Get fired	0.18	-0.45	1.34*	0.46
Relax a lot	0.49	-0.38	1.09*	0.38
Lose the respect of the boss	0.84	-0.27	2.05*	-0.39
Get others at work mad at you	1.03	0.07	1.76*	-0.36
Get a bad reputation	1.71*	0.69	1.63*	-0.50
Get your pay docked	1.79*	0.81	1.42*	-0.33
Are warned by the boss	1.61*	0.96	0.75	0.51
Have more fun	2.15*	0.99	0.17	0.35
Have to make up an excuse	1.39*	1.10*	0.33	0.96
Lose the trust of others	1.52*	1.66*	-0.04	1.00*
Make others do your work	1.76*	1.99*	-0.60	1.36*
Try to make up for it	-0.05	-0.10	0.42	1.61*
Lose your chance to get ahead in the company	0.96	0.24	1.25*	0.36
Don't get tired at the end of the day	0.85	-0.39	1.43*	0.05

1. Fun with bad consequences
2. Lose trust
3. Lose respect, job
4. Guilt

Factor Correlation Matrix

	1	2	3	4
1				
2	-0.76			
3	0.02	0.56		
4	0.58	-0.04	0.76	

*Highest factor loadings

Table 14 (Continued)

Group Means on Original Factor Scores

Group	1	2	3	4
1	-0.03	2.38	3.98	3.13
2	1.81	-0.19	2.54	3.03
3	2.03	-0.03	2.71	2.86
4	2.04	-0.20	2.27	2.70

Discriminant Functions

Factors	Function 1	Function 2	Function 3
1	0.5116	-0.7435	-0.3195
2	-0.1941	-0.2772	-0.6004
3	0.3226	-0.5959	0.4277
4	-0.7723	0.1241	0.5954
5			
6			
% of Variance	75.8	19.1	5.08

Group Means on Discriminant Functions

Group	Function 1	Function 2	Function 3
1	-1.61	-2.62	2.14
2	-0.56	-2.43	2.43
3	-0.29	-2.76	2.23
4	-0.28	-2.48	2.05

Overall F-ratio 1.60 (df = 12, 241) $.10 > p > .05$

Table 15

"To be late to work (often), you have to..."

	Rotated Factor Matrix			
Items	I	II	III	IV
Not care if you get fired	-0.11	-0.14	2.12*	-0.09
Be lazy	-0.22	+0.00	1.81*	0.43
Live far away from work	0.44	0.45	0.51	1.48*
Not have a good car	0.33	0.64	0.29	1.31*
Drink a lot	0.59	0.22	0.54	-0.02
Not like the job	0.93	-0.15	0.81	-0.43
Not have self-control	1.49*	-0.08	0.14	-0.41
Have to take care of your family before you leave	1.78*	0.11	-0.58	0.40
Be undependable	1.77*	-0.35	0.07	-0.01
Have good excuses	0.59	0.76	0.34	-1.49*
Spend too much time getting ready	0.66	1.30*	-0.41	-0.08
Miss your bus	-0.25	1.85*	-0.16	0.22
Run into heavy traffic	-0.05	1.78*	-0.23	0.46
Get up late	-0.19	1.70*	0.13	-0.76
Not like the boss	-0.30	1.10*	0.68	-0.48

1. Dependability
2. Environmental factors
3. Laziness
4. Transportation problems

Factor Correlation Matrix

	1	2	3	4
1				
2	0.96			
3	0.95	0.94		
4	0.28	0.25	0.22	

*Highest factor loadings

Table 15 (Continued)

Group Means on Original Factor Scores

Group	1	2	3	4
1	3.72	3.36	3.14	0.02
2	4.13	3.37	3.56	0.46
3	3.80	3.65	3.65	0.06
4	3.62	3.31	3.69	0.46

Discriminant Functions

Factors	Function 1	Function 2
1	-0.2703	-0.5654
2	-0.1588	0.6354
3	0.9103	-0.1973
4	-0.2704	-0.4876
5		
6		
% of Variance	69.1	27.3

Group Means on Discriminant Functions

Group	Function 1	Function 2
1	1.31	-0.60
2	1.47	-1.12
3	1.70	-0.58
4	0.82	-0.70

Overall F-ratio 1.59 (df = 12, 246) $.10 > p > .05$

Table 16

"If you are late to work (often), you..."

Items	I	II	III	IV
Try to get up earlier in the morning	0.08	-0.08	2.19*	0.32
Feel like you are letting people down	-0.20	1.04*	1.20*	-0.33
Get a bad reputation	-0.22	1.35*	0.85	-0.49
Get fired	-0.26	1.23*	0.52	0.01
Do your work badly	-0.39	1.67*	-0.49	0.65
Are not liked by other workers	0.73	0.33	-0.39	1.29*
Make some excuse	1.57*	-0.55	0.67	0.39
Get your pay docked	1.78*	0.32	-0.37	-0.23
Have a talk with the boss	2.17*	-0.39	-0.01	0.01
Lose your chance to get ahead	1.27*	0.34	0.45	-0.56
Lose the boss' trust	1.17*	-0.15	0.87	0.04
Aren't so tired when you get to work	1.15*	1.05*	-0.94	-0.18
Lose the respect of others	0.83	1.03*	-0.36	-0.11
Feel like you are getting away with something	0.24	0.28	-0.17	1.74*
Can stay out later at night	-0.23	-0.08	0.38	2.37*

1. Trouble with boss
2. Bad reputation, work
3. Try to avoid it
4.

Factor Correlation Matrix

	1	2	3	4
1				
2	0.95			
3	0.92	0.93		
4	0.87	0.89	0.80	

*Highest factor loading

Table 16 (Continued)

Group Means on Original Factor Scores

Group	1	2	3	4
1	3.65	3.91	3.16	1.85
2	3.58	3.88	2.66	2.06
3	3.55	4.16	2.69	2.29
4	3.28	3.78	2.28	2.00

Discriminant Functions

Factors	Function 1	Function 2
1	0.3303	-0.0165
2	-0.3021	-0.5206
3	0.8849	0.0035
4	0.1291	-0.8537
5		
6		
% of Variance	71.1	26.5

Group Means on Discriminant Functions

Group	Function 1	Function 2
1	3.06	-3.67
2	2.63	-3.82
3	2.59	-4.17
4	2.22	-3.72

Overall F-ratio 0.93 (df = 12, 238) N/S

Table 17

"To goof off on your job, you have to..."

	Rotated Factor Matrix			
Items	I	II	III	IV
Want to play around	2.18*	-0.23	0.29	-0.10
Not like your work	1.27*	1.17*	-0.55	-0.04
Not get along with the boss	0.46	1.14*	0.01	0.01
Not have enough work	0.10	1.02*	0.34	-0.01
Lack interest in the job (it does not "move" you)	-0.40	1.96*	-0.09	0.01
Be lazy	1.07*	-0.11	-0.29	1.17*
Not have ambition	0.53	-0.43	-0.00	1.82*
Have a boring job	-0.36	0.26	-0.21	1.96*
Not have the boss watching you	-0.73	0.24	0.51	1.45*
Not care if you get fired	-0.06	0.64	0.86	0.12
Have friends that goof off	-0.29	0.54	0.94	0.26
Not be dependable	0.10	-0.06	1.46*	0.09
Not care about other's safety	0.20	-0.17	1.79*	-0.27
Not be afraid of the boss	0.24	0.27	1.43*	-0.28
Not like the others at work	0.06	-0.41	1.55*	0.28

1. Fun
2. Dissatisfaction with job
3. Uncaring attitude
4. Laziness

Factor Correlation Matrix

	1	2	3	4
1				
2	0.94			
3	0.93	0.95		
4	0.92	0.94	0.95	

*Highest factor loadings

Table 17 (Continued)

Group Means on Original Factor Scores

Group	1	2	3	4
1	2.70	3.96	3.40	3.33
2	3.32	3.42	3.75	3.56
3	3.18	4.07	3.87	3.76
4	2.25	3.38	3.13	2.84

Discriminant Functions

Factors	Function 1	Function 2
1	0.7637	0.2221
2	-0.5138	-0.9061
3	0.1700	0.2420
4	0.3520	-0.2667
5		
6		
% of Variance	72.9	26.5

Group Means on Discriminant Functions

Group	Function 1	Function 2
1	1.78	-3.06
2	2.67	-2.40
3	2.32	-3.05
4	1.51	-2.57

Overall F-ratio 2.34 (df = 12, 246) $p < .01$

Table 18

"If you goof off on your job, you..."

Items	Rotated Factor Matrix I	II	III	IV
Get fired	0.04	0.85	0.24	1.22*
Get hurt in an accident	0.04	1.69*	0.19	0.25
Cause others to get hurt	-0.41	1.61*	0.90	0.22
Lose a chance for promotion	0.37	1.71*	0.27	0.02
Have more fun on the job	-0.25	0.64	-0.50	2.06*
Lose others' respect	1.32*	1.28*	-0.33	-0.44
Get "chewed out" by the boss	1.69*	0.40	-0.07	-0.16
Lose the friendship of other workers	1.77*	0.20	-0.49	0.10
Make other workers laugh	-0.08	0.07	-0.19	2.10*
Don't do your job right	1.79*	-0.11	-0.33	0.21
Aren't so tired at the end of the day	0.39	-1.09*	0.27	1.92*
Get a reputation for being lazy	1.65*	-0.51	0.53	-0.09
Don't get along with the boss	1.06*	-0.82	1.27*	0.15
Feel guilty for making others do your work	0.29	-0.61	1.56*	0.65
Let down the people who depend on you	-0.24	0.36	2.64*	-0.31

1. Bad reputation
2. Hurt self, others
3. Guilt--let down others
4. Fun, bad consequences

Factor Correlation Matrix

	1	2	3	4
1				
2	0.92			
3	0.93	0.87		
4	0.94	0.90	0.90	

*Highest factor loadings

Table 18 (Continued)

Group Means on Original Factor Scores

Group	1	2	3	4
1	3.96	2.00	2.88	2.74
2	3.32	2.14	2.51	3.13
3	3.83	2.70	2.49	3.05
4	3.15	2.37	2.63	2.78

Discriminant Functions

Factors	Function 1	Function 2	Function 3
1	0.8998	0.2533	0.0055
2	-0.3917	0.6898	0.4780
3	-0.0598	-0.5627	0.1873
4	-0.1827	0.3788	-0.8582
5			
6			
% of Variance	50.9	36.9	12.2

Group Means on Discriminant Functions

Group	Function 1	Function 2	Function 3
1	2.11	1.80	-0.83
2	1.43	2.09	-1.17
3	1.69	2.58	-0.84
4	1.24	2.01	-0.74

Overall F-ratio 2.04 (df = 12, 241) $p < .05$

Table 19

To Get Along with your Boss

Items	Rotated Factor Matrix I	II	III	IV
Be friendly to him	-0.05	0.55	1.52*	-0.29
Do good work	0.06	-0.36	2.33*	-0.39
Be a reliable worker (don't be late; come each day)	0.52	-0.20	1.31*	0.10
Be ambitious (show you want to get ahead)	-0.14	-0.21	1.59*	0.41
Agree with his ideas	-0.66	0.86	1.03*	0.37
Work overtime	-1.03*	0.59	0.69	1.13*
Show respect for him	+0.00	0.23	0.43	1.13*
Correct him if you think he is wrong	-0.02	-0.56	-0.31	2.30*
Do what he tells you to	0.38	0.78	-0.33	1.07*
Show interest in the job (dig it)	0.61	-0.19	0.45	0.88
have a good job	1.38*	0.41	-0.10	-0.01
Pay attention to him	1.36*	-0.01	0.39	-0.08
Really like him (not just act like you do)	1.14*	0.34	-0.52	0.70
Laugh at his jokes	0.07	2.42*	-0.17	-0.31
Be yourself	1.15*	-0.00	0.81	-0.11

1. Sincerity
2. Ingratiation
3. Protestant Ethic
4. Independence and sincerity

Factor Correlation Matrix

	1	2	3	4
1				
2	0.93			
3	0.96	0.93		
4	0.95	0.94	0.95	

*Highest factor loadings

Table 19 (Continued)

Group Means on Original Factor Scores

Group	1	2	3	4
1	3.96	2.76	4.45	3.85
2	3.39	3.44	3.04	3.70
3	3.74	3.19	4.12	3.60
4	3.47	2.91	3.78	3.84

Discriminant Functions

Factors	Function 1	Function 2
1	-0.0600	0.1999
2	-0.5110	0.6317
3	0.8518	0.2203
4	-0.0986	-0.7159
5		
6		
% of Variance	84.7	14.0

Group Means on Discriminant Functions

Group	Function 1	Function 2
1	1.76	0.76
2	0.26	0.87
3	1.30	1.09
4	1.14	0.62

Overall F-ratio 2.88 (df = 12, 246) $p < .01$

Table 20

"If you get along with your boss at work, you..."

	Rotated Factor Matrix				
Items	I	II	III	IV	V
Get better pay	0.30	0.08	-0.36	-0.13	1.85*
Get to work later	0.87	-0.55	0.78	-0.03	1.29*
Go places together	1.70*	0.08	-0.23	-0.16	0.68
Invite him to your place	1.87*	0.10	-0.19	0.35	-0.12
Get better working conditions	0.47	-0.70	0.59	1.74*	-0.23
Enjoy your work more	0.40	0.82	-0.36	1.13*	-0.69
Get help with the job when you need it	0.19	1.42*	0.24	0.17	-0.38
Do better work	-0.04	0.83	-0.54	1.05*	-0.16
Feel he respects you	-0.50	1.53*	0.29	-0.29	0.74
Try not to let him down	-0.78	0.66	-0.09	0.50	1.19*
Get ahead faster	-0.04	1.53*	-0.03	-0.23	0.29
Don't get along with other workers	-0.13	0.13	2.44*	0.10	-0.07
Feel more confident at work	-0.57	-0.15	-0.04	1.35*	0.80
Do what he asks	-0.25	0.25	-0.01	1.25*	0.25
Can talk to him about your problems	0.80	1.55*	0.42	-0.32	-0.44

1. Social behavior
2. Help at work, respect
3. Coworker hostility
4. More effort, satisfaction
5. More pay and obligations

Factor Correlation Matrix

	1	2	3	4	5
1					
2	0.86				
3	0.85	0.85			
4	0.86	0.97	0.84		
5	0.90	0.93	0.86	0.94	

*Highest factor loadings

Table 20 (Continued)

Group Means on Original Factor Scores

Group	1	2	3	4	5
1	1.54	4.51	1.36	4.52	3.10
2	2.61	4.35	2.41	3.82	3.47
3	2.23	4.00	1.90	4.40	3.29
4	2.17	3.94	1.93	4.06	2.96

Discriminant Functions

Factors	Function 1	Function 2	Function 3
1	-0.5313	0.2664	-0.0390
2	-0.2852	-0.7694	0.0949
3	-0.5675	0.1331	-0.0125
4	0.5522	0.5205	-0.4856
5	-0.0972	-0.2192	-0.8681
6			
% of Variance	67.1	25.0	7.88

Group Means on Discriminant Functions

Group	Function 1	Function 2	Function 3
1	-0.68	-1.21	-4.54
2	-2.22	-1.10	-4.59
3	-1.29	-0.66	-4.72
4	-1.41	-0.73	-4.28

Overall F-ratio 1.96 (df = 15, 246) $p < .05$

Table 21

"To do your job as well as you can, you have to..."

	Rotated Factor Matrix		
Items	I	II	III
Do only what you are told to do	-0.24	2.82*	-0.01
Help other people	0.47	1.88*	-0.16
Do careful, neat work	1.39*	0.25	-0.11
Be interested in the work	1.00*	0.51	0.27
Know why you are doing each kind of job	1.00*	0.21	0.41
Do the work as fast as you can	-0.42	0.85	1.31*
Want to do a good job	0.01	0.11	1.54*
Have good training	0.09	-0.45	1.66*
Work hard	-0.05	-0.16	1.68*
Understand what is expected of you	2.01*	-0.39	-0.26
Learn new skills	1.45*	-0.22	0.13
Be a dependable worker	1.21*	-0.26	0.45
Like the job	1.42	0.43	-0.10
Need to keep the job	1.15*	0.63	-0.05
Want to prove your ability	1.68*	-0.48	-0.00

1. Intrinsic motivation
2.
3. Effort--skill

Factor Correlation Matrix

	1	2	3
I			
2	0.92		
3	0.97	0.92	

*Highest factor loadings

Table 21 (Continued)

Group Means on Original Factor Scores

Group	1	2	3
1	5.07	2.38	4.86
2	4.15	2.63	4.25
3	4.41	2.61	4.48
4	4.11	2.27	4.00

Discriminant Functions

Factors	Function 1	Function 2
1	0.8473	-0.3716
2	-0.4272	0.7996
3	0.3156	0.4719
4		
5		
6		
% of Variance	63.6	36.4

Group Means on Discriminant Functions

Group	Function 1	Function 2
1	4.81	2.31
2	3.74	2.57
3	4.04	2.56
4	3.77	2.18

Overall F-ratio 1.10 (df = 9, 229) N/S

Table 22

"If you do your job as well as you can, you..."

Items	Rotated Factor Matrix I	II	III	IV
Feel satisfaction	0.37	0.11	1.40*	-0.68
Get a raise	-0.27	0.26	1.46*	-0.17
Get promoted	-0.28	-0.16	1.66*	0.02
Respect yourself more	0.34	1.79*	-0.07	-0.33
Feel tired at the end of the day	-0.47	1.89*	-0.08	0.47
Enjoy the job more	-0.13	1.41*	0.37	-0.07
Get along with the boss	0.73	1.25*	-0.05	-0.08
Get offered jobs by other companies	-0.28	-0.09	1.28*	0.58
Get more respect from others	0.30	-0.15	1.18*	0.30
Make other workers look bad	-0.94	0.07	0.89	1.77*
Feel proud of yourself	0.19	0.22	1.27*	-0.25
Make your family proud of you	0.90	-0.29	1.25*	-0.27
Have a good work record	1.96*	0.19	-0.16	0.25
Want to do even better than before	1.77*	-0.31	0.23	0.41
Don't have time for anything else	0.58	0.03	-0.36	2.42*

1. Achievement
2. Respect, satisfaction
3. Advancement, pride
4. Narrow life--showoff

Factor Correlation Matrix

	1	2	3	4
1				
2	0.94			
3	0.96	0.96		
4	0.87	0.89	0.90	

*Highest factor loadings

Table 22 (Continued)

Group Means on Original Factor Scores

Group	1	2	3	4
1	3.80	4.16	5.01	1.51
2	3.18	3.57	4.51	2.58
3	3.23	4.13	4.83	2.07
4	2.93	3.18	4.18	2.17

Discriminant Functions

Factors	Function 1	Function 2
1	0.0786	-0.4302
2	0.6345	0.5259
3	0.3136	0.2673
4	-0.7021	0.6833
5		
6		
% of Variance	77.8	18.8

Group Means on Discriminant Functions

Group	Function 1	Function 2
1	3.45	2.93
2	2.12	3.48
3	2.94	3.49
4	2.03	3.01

Overall F-ratio 3.23 (df = 12, 238) $p < .01$

Table 23

"To get along with other people at work, you have to..."

	Rotated Factor Matrix			
Items	I	II	III	IV
Be nice to them (Considerate)	0.22	-0.96	1.42*	0.40
Work just as hard as they do and no harder	0.35	0.34	1.97*	-0.88
Be friendly to them	0.68	-0.45	1.00*	0.43
Do good work	-0.32	-0.24	1.17*	0.67
Help them if they need it	-0.65	-0.01	1.62*	0.24
Be interested in other's work	-0.53	1.02*	0.55	0.79
"Play up" to the boss	0.14	2.42*	0.15	-0.06
Gossip	0.14	2.85*	-0.15	-0.01
Show respect for others	0.07	0.42	-0.31	1.71*
Control your temper	-0.29	0.19	-0.02	1.76*
Agree with them	-0.98	1.11*	0.42	0.87
Be yourself (not phoney)	0.46	-0.37	-0.33	1.80*
Do your share of work	0.51	-0.55	0.01	1.50*
Do things together off the job	1.12*	1.08*	0.44	-0.19
Be modest (don't brag)	1.78*	0.28	0.06	0.34

1. Humility
2. Ingratiation
3. Helpfulness--consideration
4. Sincerity

Factor Correlation Matrix

	1	2	3	4
1				
2	0.82			
3	0.91	0.84		
4	0.91	0.84	0.97	

*Highest factor loadings

Table 23 (Continued)

Group Means on Original Factor Scores

Group	1	2	3	4
1	2.36	1.24	4.85	5.14
2	2.73	2.12	4.04	4.01
3	1.98	1.57	4.13	4.32
4	2.32	1.74	4.05	4.03

Discriminant Functions

Factors	Function 1	Function 2
1	-0.5783	0.8077
2	-0.5634	0.1374
3	0.1322	0.4852
4	0.5750	0.3057
5		
6		
% of Variance	83.1	15.0

Group Means on Discriminant Functions

Group	Function 1	Function 2
1	1.53	6.01
2	0.07	5.68
3	1.00	5.14
4	0.53	5.31

Overall F-ratio 2.37 (df = 12, 246) $p < .01$

Table 24

"If you get along with other people at work, you..."

	Rotated Factor Matrix				
Items	I	II	III	IV	V
Go places together	-0.37	0.82	-0.68	0.84	0.62
Make new friends	-1.37*	0.84	0.60	0.10	0.91
Help them if they need it	-0.35	0.79	0.50	0.37	0.37
Enjoy working more	-0.15	0.77	0.49	0.87	-0.14
Don't skip work	-0.07	-0.12	-0.36	2.33*	-0.06
Work harder	0.48	-0.35	1.01*	1.44*	-0.35
Feel like the time goes by faster	-0.38	0.02	2.22*	-0.11	-0.05
Get help if you need it	-0.01	0.07	2.25*	-0.22	-0.30
Feel that you are respected	0.29	-0.29	1.73*	-0.04	0.48
Aren't bored on the job	0.54	-0.57	0.54	0.24	1.43*
Play around during working hours	-0.03	-0.08	-0.35	-0.28	1.99*
Get ahead faster at work	1.34*	0.34	0.02	0.35	0.28
Get better pay	1.70*	0.38	-0.03	-0.05	0.39
Keep the job longer	0.87	1.28*	0.45	-0.41	-0.16
Are happier at home	0.09	2.05*	-0.19	-0.20	-0.24

1. Advancement
2. Security
3. More effort and satisfaction
4. Better employee
5. Fun

Factor Correlation Matrix

	1	2	3	4	5
1					
2	0.87				
3	0.83	0.95			
4	0.83	0.94	0.93		
5	0.84	0.95	0.94	0.94	

*Highest factor loadings

Table 24 (Continued)

Group Means on Original Factor Scores

Group	1	2	3	4	5
1	1.41	4.28	3.87	3.57	3.76
2	2.19	3.90	3.13	3.67	3.87
3	1.38	4.09	3.35	3.21	3.54
4	1.99	4.22	3.01	2.84	3.16

Discriminant Functions

Factors	Function 1	Function 2
1	-0.4950	-0.5789
2	-0.2297	0.5424
3	0.6166	0.2000
4	0.3896	-0.4582
5	0.4127	-0.3475
6		
% of Variance	58.8	37.7

Group Means on Discriminant Functions

Group	Function 1	Function 2
1	3.65	-0.67
2	2.98	-1.55
3	3.16	-0.61
4	2.31	-0.66

Overall F-ratio 2.90 (df = 15, 243) $p < .01$

PROXIMAL JOB CONSEQUENCES

Table 25

"To quit a job, you have to..."

Items	Rotated Factor Matrix I	II	III	IV	V
Not get along with your boss	0.18	-0.05	-0.48	0.05	1.96*
Get a better job someplace else	-0.15	0.93	0.37	-1.00*	1.17*
Get tired of your job	0.04	-0.29	0.22	-0.05	1.77*
Not like the job	0.01	0.10	0.08	0.78	1.00*
Be lazy	0.18	0.14	-0.10	1.97*	-0.01
Have no ambition	-0.02	0.05	0.34	1.76*	0.00
Not like the other people at work	-1.00*	0.78	0.78	0.41	0.32
Have to work too hard for the pay you get	-0.40	-0.32	1.83*	0.38	0.24
Get low pay	0.41	0.18	1.94*	-0.26	-0.44
Argue with the boss	1.46*	-0.45	0.64	0.11	0.31
Not be interested in the job	1.81*	0.39	-0.17	0.20	0.07
Have no chance to get ahead	0.64	1.51*	0.43	-0.69	-0.29
Have bad working conditions	-0.01	1.39*	-0.08	0.09	0.23
Not do well on the job	0.16	1.65*	-0.42	0.66	-0.31
Travel too far to work	-0.32	1.67*	-0.10	0.07	0.03

1. Bad boss, dull job
2. Bad job
3. Inequity
4. Laziness
5. Advancement

Factor Correlation Matrix

	1	2	3	4	5
1					
2	0.90				
3	0.90	0.94			
4	0.84	0.91	0.90		
5	0.91	0.95	0.94	0.90	

*Highest factor loadings

Table 25 (Continued)

Group Means on Original Factor Scores

Group	1	2	3	4	5
1	2.45	4.07	3.15	1.88	4.07
2	2.33	2.92	2.88	2.58	3.52
3	2.55	3.90	3.59	2.68	3.77
4	1.90	3.32	3.01	2.03	2.96

Discriminant Functions

Factors	Function 1	Function 2	Function 3
1	-0.2689	0.2799	0.0539
2	0.6807	0.1382	0.2436
3	0.0884	-0.2175	0.6334
4	-0.6664	-0.0374	0.4440
5	-0.1118	0.9241	-0.5826
6			
% of Variance	53.7	30.7	15.6

Group Means on Discriminant Functions

Group	Function 1	Function 2	Function 3
1	0.69	4.25	1.59
2	-0.50	3.58	1.76
3	0.08	3.85	2.36
4	0.33	3.00	1.99

Overall F-ratio 2.59 (df = 15, 254) $p < .01$

Table 26

"If you quit your job, you..."

	Rotated Factor Matrix				
Items	I	II	III	IV	V
Look for another one	-0.14	2.73*	-0.25	+0.00	-0.15
Relax	-0.06	-0.09	1.37*	-0.19	1.11
Feel less safe	0.59	1.46*	-0.01	-0.36	0.26
Are unhappy	1.08*	0.75	-0.78	0.54	0.24
Don't have the money to take care of yourself and your family	1.87*	-0.02	-0.06	0.13	0.27
Can't pay your bills	1.95*	-0.08	0.35	0.11	-0.01
Respect yourself more	0.38	-0.12	2.36*	0.12	0.03
Take a better job	0.06	2.24*	0.69	-0.21	-0.46
Have a bad work record	-1.10*	0.35	-0.45	1.28*	1.20*
Stop doing things you like because you can't afford them	0.33	0.98	-0.79	0.09	0.92
Have trouble finding another job	-0.11	0.60	-0.47	0.14	1.43*
Try to collect welfare	0.23	-0.64	0.33	-0.38	2.19*
Feel you've done the right thing	-0.70	1.07*	1.58*	0.39	0.13
Argue with your family	0.50	-0.32	0.25	1.77*	-0.18
Lose others' respect	+0.00	-0.05	0.14	2.12*	-0.31

1. Fail obligations
2. Justified quitting with anxiety
3. Justified quitting without anxiety
4. Lose respect
5. Future unemployment

Factor Correlation Matrix

	1	2	3	4	5
1					
2	0.91				
3	0.82	0.82			
4	0.89	0.92	0.79		
5	0.90	0.92	0.82	0.93	

---

*Highest factor loadings

Table 26 (Continued)

Group Means on Original Factor Scores

Group	1	2	3	4	5
1	2.34	3.39	1.50	2.35	2.26
2	2.57	2.95	1.63	3.05	3.35
3	2.50	3.15	1.40	3.05	3.33
4	2.36	2.82	1.94	2.88	2.88

Discriminant Functions

Factors	Function 1	Function 2
1	-0.0627	0.0935
2	-0.7763	0.4580
3	-0.0216	-0.7570
4	0.2616	-0.2187
5	0.5698	0.4008
6		
% of Variance	67.0	32.4

Group Means on Discriminant Functions

Group	Function 1	Function 2
1	-0.91	1.02
2	0.22	1.03
3	0.06	1.29
4	0.01	0.57

Overall F-ratio 1.94 (df = 15, 246) $p < .05$

Table 27

To Get a Promotion

Items	Rotated Factor Matrix		
	I	II	III
Do good work	-0.41	2.05*	-0.15
Be on time every day	-0.18	1.62*	0.08
Come to work every day	0.15	1.27*	0.24
Show improvement in your work	0.23	1.56*	-0.19
Work hard	0.19	1.27*	0.20
Not talk back to the boss	1.99*	-0.22	0.06
Show interest in the job	0.69	1.62*	-0.59
Show you can be a leader	1.36*	0.46	0.01
Pay attention to the boss	0.89	0.63	0.20
Accept more responsibility	0.09	1.44*	-0.00
Be friendly to the boss	0.41	-0.01	1.20*
Do extra work	0.73	-0.75	1.75*
Like your work	-0.18	0.46	1.30*
Learn new skills	-0.75	0.43	1.68*
Do things for the company's good	-0.50	1.38*	0.53

1. "Yes man"
2. Company man
3. Extra work

Factor Correlation Matrix

	1	2	3
1			
2	0.95		
3	0.94	0.97	

*Highest factor loadings

Table 27 (Continued)

Group Means on Original Factor Scores

Group	1	2	3
1	3.67	4.95	4.30
2	3.01	4.13	4.27
3	3.16	4.58	4.08
4	3.09	3.93	3.85

Discriminant Functions

Factors	Function 1	Function 2	Function 3
1	0.1702	-0.6417	0.7449
2	0.8762	0.1421	-0.4456
3	-0.4510	0.7537	0.4965
4			
5			
6			
% of Variance	75.0	16.9	8.08

Group Means on Discriminant Functions

Group	Function 1	Function 2	Function 3
1	3.02	1.59	2.66
2	2.21	1.88	2.52
3	2.11	1.70	2.34
4	2.23	1.48	2.46

Overall F-ratio 1.56 (df = 9, 229) N/S

Table 28

"If you get a promotion, you..."

Items	Rotated Factor Matrix I	II	III
Have more money	-0.40	1.34*	0.60
Change your ideas about work	0.07	2.09*	-0.67
Work harder at the new job	0.23	1.39*	0.03
Buy the things you want most	0.73	0.77	0.31
Want to get ahead even more	0.96	0.74	0.15
Demand respect from other people	2.06*	-0.04	-0.23
Are happier at home	1.00*	0.20	0.56
Are proud of yourself	-0.24	0.79	1.04*
Have more power	-0.28	0.87	0.88
Accept more responsibility	-0.62	0.75	1.29*
Make plans for the future	-0.02	-0.09	1.68*
Feel safer	-0.16	-0.38	1.98*
Try to learn more about the job	0.53	0.16	0.98
Get more respect from people	0.87	-0.71	1.53*
Save some more money	-0.19	-0.32	2.00*

1. Respect and ambition
2. Money and ambition
3. Security, future plans

Factor Correlation Matrix

	1	2	3
1			
2	0.95		
3	0.95	0.97	

*Highest factor loadings

Table 28 (Continued)

Group Means on Original Factor Scores

Group	1	2	3
I	3.05	4.08	4.53
2	3.20	4.16	4.31
3	3.45	4.60	4.51
4	3.51	3.81	3.81

Discriminant Functions

Factors	Function 1	Function 2
1	-0.6631	-0.4577
2	0.3261	-0.7770
3	0.6737	0.4321
4		
5		
6		
% of Variance	73.5	26.1

Group Means on Discriminant Functions

Group	Function 1	Function 2
1	2.36	-2.61
2	2.14	-2.83
3	2.25	-3.20
4	1.48	-2.92

Overall F-ratio 2.19 (df = 9, 224) $p < .05$

Table 29

"To get a raise, you have to..."

	Rotated Factor Matrix		
Items	I	II	III
Learn new skills	0.15	0.02	1.57*
Do a good job	0.78	0.54	0.28
Join a union	2.00*	-0.32	-0.04
Ask for a raise	1.83*	0.01	-0.23
Be on time every day	1.16*	0.74	-0.19
Come to work every day	0.53	1.47*	-0.43
Do things for the company's good	-0.38	1.60*	0.31
Show leadership ability	-0.18	1.91*	-0.16
Be "on the ball"	-0.13	1.67*	0.04
Be respectful to the boss	0.01	0.95	0.57
Work overtime	0.45	-0.13	1.10*
Not goof off on the job	0.82	0.23	0.63
Stay with the company for a certain time	0.85	-0.33	1.07*
Work hard	-0.41	0.38	1.50*
Want to get ahead	-0.13	-0.23	1.85*

1. External pressure on management
2. Good worker
3. Ambition

Factor Correlation Matrix

	1	2	3
1			
2	0.96		
3	0.96	0.97	

*Highest factor loadings

Table 29 (Continued)

Group Means on Original Factor Scores

Group	1	2	3
1	4.05	4.82	4.91
2	4.03	4.35	4.66
3	4.02	4.12	4.40
4	3.54	4.00	3.96

Discriminant Functions

Factors	Function 1	Function 2
1	0.5073	-0.6763
2	0.0855	0.7356
3	0.8575	-0.0385
4		
5		
6		
% of Variance	69.8	29.2

Group Means on Discriminant Functions

Group	Function 1	Function 2
1	6.68	0.61
2	6.41	0.29
3	6.16	0.14
4	5.53	0.40

Overall F-ratio 1.14 (df = 9, 226) N/S

Table 30

"If you get a raise, you..."

Items	Rotated Factor Matrix I	II	III
Buy the things you want most	-0.09	1.54*	0.64
Donate a little to charity	0.06	2.45*	-0.22
Save some money	0.07	0.88	0.91
Work harder	-0.27	-0.16	1.69*
Want to get ahead even more	0.11	-0.62	1.76*
Feel safer	1.00*	-0.18	0.62
Pay off some bills	1.13*	0.09	0.52
Do more things you'd like to do	1.45*	0.34	0.04
Are happier at home	2.18*	0.01	-0.50
Enjoy your work more	1.14*	-0.15	0.43
Make your family happy	0.34	-0.26	1.28*
Feel you've done something worth while	-0.83	0.21	2.10*
Want to stay with the job	0.02	0.14	1.35*
Are able to afford the things you need (food, shelter, etc.)	0.65	-0.07	0.96
Are proud of your work	0.20	0.01	1.28*

1. Security, happiness
2. Extra money
3. Ambition

Factor Correlation Matrix

	1	2	3
1			
2	0.90		
3	0.97	0.92	

*Highest factor loadings

Table 30 (Continued)

Group Means on Original Factor Scores

Group	1	2	3
1	4.29	2.09	5.00
2	4.41	2.65	4.64
3	4.04	2.30	4.71
4	4.07	2.39	3.94

Discriminant Functions

Factors	Function 1	Function 2
1	-0.4591	0.5357
2	-0.4301	0.8130
3	0.7773	0.2281
4		
5		
6		
% of Variance	84.7	11.8

Group Means on Discriminant Functions

Group	Function 1	Function 2
1	1.02	5.14
2	0.44	5.58
3	0.82	5.10
4	0.16	5.03

Overall F-ratio 2.54 (df = 9, 222) $p < .01$

Table 31

"To get fired from your job, you have to..."

	Rotated Factor Matrix			
Items	I	II	III	IV
Do the job badly	0.40	-0.03	-0.39	1.52*
Not get along with the boss	0.20	0.41	-0.07	0.90
Be late all the time	-0.04	0.24	0.07	1.24*
Be unreliable	-0.24	0.01	0.04	1.69*
Cause an accident	0.21	-0.35	1.44*	0.39
Not be interested in your work	0.20	0.46	0.88	0.12
Disobey the boss' orders	0.38	1.38*	0.01	-0.30
Not be dependable	0.10	1.17*	-0.65	0.67
Goof off on the job	-0.51	1.72*	0.04	0.10
Not get along with other people at work	0.15	1.22*	0.50	-0.39
Come to work drunk (or high)	1.34*	0.36	0.04	-0.18
Not have any ambition	-0.10	-0.32	0.58	1.38*
Not understand the job	-0.13	0.17	1.83*	-0.16
Quit work early all the time	1.87*	-0.35	-0.07	0.22
Disagree with the boss	1.70*	0.07	0.05	-0.20

1. Rule breaking
2. Goldbricking
3. Carelessness
4. Bad worker

Factor Correlation Matrix

	1	2	3	4
1				
2	0.95			
3	0.94	0.94		
4	0.95	0.97	0.94	

*Highest factor loading

Table 31 (Continued)

Group Means on Original Factor Scores

Group	1	2	3	4
1	3.68	4.91	3.11	4.64
2	2.93	4.69	3.24	4.13
3	4.00	4.56	3.54	4.63
4	3.33	3.56	2.75	3.29

Discriminant Functions

Factors	Function 1	Function 2	Function 3
1	-0.7747	-0.4911	-0.2843
2	0.5968	0.3667	-0.3861
3	0.0877	0.0456	0.8775
4	0.1896	-0.7888	-0.0048
5			
6			
% of Variance	61.4	33.8	4.74

Group Means on Discriminant Functions

Group	Function 1	Function 2	Function 3
1	1.23	-3.53	-0.24
2	1.60	-2.83	0.17
3	0.81	-3.79	0.19
4	0.41	-2.80	0.07

Overall F-ratio 3.55 (df = 12, 246) p < .01

Table 32

"If you're fired from your job, you..."

	Rotated Factor Matrix		
Items	I	II	III
Can't get another job easily	1.86*	-0.32	0.18
Can't pay your bills	2.00*	-0.11	-0.28
Can't afford to do the things you like	1.84*	-0.03	-0.09
Lose others' respect	0.54	0.37	0.75
Loaf around for a while	0.79	0.93	-0.06
Get mad at the boss	-0.21	0.98	1.15*
Worry	0.07	0.14	1.77*
Feel embarrassed	-0.39	0.42	1.86*
Look for another job	-0.25	-0.34	2.61*
Feel you were treated unfairly	0.40	0.45	0.94
Can't support your family	1.36*	0.39	-0.05
Lose respect for yourself	0.33	-0.01	1.32*
Try to do a better job next time	0.36	-0.51	2.06*
Try to get welfare	0.03	1.87*	-0.22
Blame it on other people	-0.18	2.25*	-0.18

1. Financial loss
2. Avoid responsibility
3. Make up for it

Factor Correlation Matrix

	1	2	3
1			
2	0.94		
3	0.95	0.93	

*Highest factor loadings

Table 32 (Continued)

Group Means on Original Factor Scores

Group	1	2	3
1	3.16	2.45	3.75
2	3.90	3.52	3.50
3	3.48	3.15	3.28
4	3.10	2.39	3.15

Discriminant Functions

Factors	Function 1	Function 2
1	0.2601	0.0715
2	0.7070	0.0673
3	-0.6577	0.9952
4		
5		
6		
% of Variance	76.3	22.3

Group Means on Discriminant Functions

Group	Function 1	Function 2
1	0.09	4.13
2	1.20	4.00
3	0.97	3.72
4	0.42	3.52

Overall F-ratio 3.11 (df = 9, 224) $p < .01$

DISTAL JOB CONSEQUENCES

Table 33

"To have your own house, you have to..."

Items	Rotated Factor Matrix I	II	III	IV
Sacrifice	0.32	1.75*	0.21	-0.39
Want to get ahead	0.29	2.02*	-0.13	-0.30
Be reliable	-0.17	1.27*	-0.19	0.56
Have a good job	-0.11	1.21*	0.02	0.61
Have money for down payment	-0.48	0.86	-0.16	1.27*
Work hard	0.10	-0.02	-0.07	1.79*
Have good credit	-0.24	0.29	-0.17	1.71*
Find an agent to sell you a house	1.09*	-0.61	-0.20	2.12*
Accept more responsibility	-0.06	-0.13	-0.33	1.98*
Be married	2.36*	0.28	0.35	0.10
Gave good judgment	0.61	-0.16	0.06	1.67*
Have a car	0.71	-0.08	2.37*	-0.31
Get a loan	-0.96	0.11	1.84*	0.44
Be ready to take care of a house	-0.21	-0.07	0.27	1.80*
Find a neighborhood you like and can afford	-0.86	0.09	0.80	1.41*

1. Legal maturity
2. Ambition
3. Available credit
4. Financial responsibility

Factor Correlation Matrix

	1	2	3	4
1				
2	0.70			
3	0.72	0.91		
4	0.69	0.97	0.91	

*Highest factor loadings

Table 33 (Continued)

Group Means on Original Factor Score

Group	1	2	3	4
1	0.33	4.00	2.52	4.14
2	1.44	4.38	2.90	3.99
3	0.75	3.82	2.11	4.00
4	1.28	3.29	2.10	3.63

Discriminant Functions

Factors	Function 1	Function 2
1	-0.5905	-0.7807
2	0.6176	-0.2865
3	0.5187	-0.3543
4	-0.0278	0.4278
5		
6		
% % of Variance	50.5	46.2

Group Means on Discriminant Functions

Group	Function 1	Function 2
1	3.47	-0.52
2	3.25	-1.70
3	2.90	-0.71
4	2.27	-1.13

Overall F-ratio 2.95 (df = 12, 246) $p < .01$

Table 34

"If you have your own home, you..."

	Rotated Factor Matrix			
Items	I	II	III	IV
Buy furniture for it	1.57*	0.39	-0.70	0.33
Keep it in good shape	0.97	0.12	0.03	0.52
Are careful who you let in it	1.27*	-0.20	0.77	-0.31
Make improvements to it	0.67	0.23	0.37	0.49
Live there for a long time	0.59	-1.20	0.90	0.64
Invite neighbors over	-0.07	-0.36	1.23*	0.73
Work hard to pay for it	0.61	0.43	-0.14	0.80
Learn how to do repairs	0.01	0.69	0.76	0.56
Do without other things	-0.14	0.35	2.13*	-0.32
Are happy with it	-0.11	-0.32	-0.17	1.65*
Have privacy	-0.30	-0.16	-0.17	1.88*
Feel safe	0.15	0.28	-0.56	1.54*
Don't depend on others	0.07	2.13*	0.30	0.04
Have more responsibilities	-0.36	0.22	0.44	1.38*
Have a better place to raise a family	2.01*	-0.18	-0.03	-0.40

1. Care of home
2. Independence
3. Sacrifice
4. Security and responsibility

Factor Correlation Matrix

	1	2	3	4
1				
2	0.87			
3	0.95	0.87		
4	0.97	0.87	0.95	

*Highest factor loadings

Table 34 (Continued)

Group Means on Original Factor Scores

Group	1	2	3	4
1	4.97	2.39	3.64	5.37
2	4.44	1.95	4.17	4.63
3	4.91	1.57	3.13	5.05
4	3.99	1.74	3.08	3.95

Discriminant Functions

Factors	Function 1	Function 2	Function 3
1	0.3401	0.0535	0.2317
2	-0.2567	0.1090	-0.8617
3	-0.7820	0.7702	0.4352
4	o.4549	0.6262	-0.1199
5			
6			
% of Variance	57.3	33.7	9.06

Group Means on Discriminant Functions

Group	Function 1	Function 2	Function 3
1	0.67	6.69	0.03
2	-0.15	6.56	0.61
3	1.12	6.80	0.54
4	0.30	7.14	0.30

Overall F-ratio 4.28 (df = 12, 238) $p < .01$

Table 35

"To not get your bills paid on time, you have to..."

	Rotated Factor Matrix				
Items	I	II	III	IV	V
Not get paid on time	-0.89	0.21	0.52	-0.78	2.01*
Forget when they are due	-0.35	0.38	0.15	-0.48	1.55*
Be an unreliable person	0.71	-0.19	-0.56	0.16	1.33*
Not care if you get in trouble	0.62	-0.31	-0.35	0.35	1.18*
Run up big bills	0.35	-0.44	-0.03	0.64	1.16*
Not have a budget	-0.14	0.19	0.11	2.36*	-0.13
Not have money on hand	-0.39	-0.56	0.39	0.81	1.48*
Spend your money for something else	0.48	0.35	-0.66	0.11	1.28*
Buy too many expensive things	0.91	0.41	-0.36	-0.01	0.79
Lose money gambling	-0.11	1.73*	-0.11	0.04	0.55
Drink too much	0.24	1.89*	0.03	0.28	-0.33
Lose your job	-0.37	0.65	1.69*	0.35	-0.01
Have a sudden emergency (doctor bills, car wreck, etc.)	0.45	-0.41	1.98*	0.14	0.19
Be robbed	0.73	-0.01	1.33*	-0.44	0.23
Be immature (not grown up)	2.07*	0.11	0.33	-0.24	-0.32

1. Immaturity
2. Irresponsibility
3. Unusual emergency
4. Lack of planning
5. Unreliability

Factor Correlation Matrix

	1	2	3	4	5
1					
2	0.90				
3	0.89	0.88			
4	0.89	0.85	0.84		
5	0.93	0.91	0.91	0.92	

*Highest factor loadings

Table 35 (Continued)

Group Means on Original Factor Scores

Group	1	2	3	4	5
1	3.00	1.64	2.27	2.70	3.97
2	2.62	2.06	2.53	2.21	4.04
3	3.11	2.88	2.39	2.79	3.77
4	2.54	2.41	2.25	2.21	3.25

Discriminant Functions

Factors	Function 1	Function 2	Function 3
1	-0.0198	0.5727	-0.4061
2	0.7219	-0.2755	0.5036
3	-0.0755	-0.1050	0.3501
4	0.2808	0.7648	-0.1211
5	-0.6276	-0.1370	0.6665
6			
% of Variance	74.1	19.0	6.91

Group Means on Discriminant Functions

Group	Function 1	Function 2	Function 3
1	-0.78	3.04	2.72
2	-0.67	2.30	3.29
3	0.25	2.82	3.20
4	0.10	2.20	2.87

Overall F-ratio 2.77 (df = 15, 257) $p < .01$

Table 36

"If you don't pay your bills on time, you..."

	Rotated Factor Matrix				
Items	I	II	III	IV	V
Have a bad credit rating	-0.47	2.08*	0.50	-0.59	0.31
Lose the respect of others	-0.18	1.99*	0.12	-0.02	-0.33
Need a co-signer to get credit	-0.02	1.70*	-0.28	0.03	0.25
Lose the things you have bought	0.78	1.41*	-0.59	0.64	-0.48
Have a collection agency after you	0.82	1.32*	-0.62	0.34	-0.01
Buy some other things you want	2.65*	-0.12	0.36	-0.19	0.03
Worry more	0.86	-0.01	-0.09	1.22*	0.25
Feel guilty	-0.14	-0.22	-0.20	2.06*	0.08
Lose others' trust	-0.29	-0.11	0.22	2.15*	-0.26
Have to pay extra charges	-0.67	0.42	1.10*	1.16*	-0.07
Lose your job	0.90	0.01	1.92*	-0.06	-0.02
Lose some self-respect	-0.24	0.27	0.94	0.45	0.65
Have money problems	-0.45	0.31	0.11	0.01	1.87*
Look for bargains	0.21	-0.12	0.06	-0.26	2.27*
Try to get help with the way you spend money	0.43	-0.13	-0.79	0.69	1.40*

1. Gratification
2. Bad credit record
3. Lose job, respect, pay more
4. Guilt, lose trust
5. Change habits

Factor Correlation Matrix

	1	2	3	4	5
1					
2	0.88				
3	0.79	0.86			
4	0.85	0.94	0.86		
5	0.83	0.93	0.85	0.94	

*Highest factor loadings

Table 36 (Continued)

Group Means on Original Factor Scores

Group	1	2	3	4	5
1	1.14	3.72	1.94	3.90	3.49
2	1.77	3.14	1.66	3.32	2.71
3	2.08	3.95	1.76	3.47	3.31
4	2.13	3.10	1.93	3.06	2.69

Discriminant Functions

Factors	Function 1	Function 2
1	-0.8587	-0.5334
2	0.3606	-0.5995
3	-0.1020	0.1924
4	0.2597	0.3664
5	0.2342	-0.4299
6		
% of Variance	66.0	30.1

Group Means on Discriminant Functions

Group	Function 1	Function 2
1	2.00	-2.53
2	0.95	-2.45
3	1.14	-3.29
4	0.51	-2.66

Overall F-ratio 2.43 (df = 15, 246) $p < .01$

Table 37

To Pay Bills

Items	Rotated Factor Matrix I	II	III
Be a dependable person	-0.25	0.32	1.53*
Keep a budget	-0.54	0.28	1.77*
Know when bills are due	0.15	0.47	1.12*
Have money on hand	-0.06	0.89	0.93
Have a good job	0.33	1.19*	0.18
Save money from your pay	0.20	1.26*	0.31
Not run up big bills	0.09	1.88*	-0.22
Pay cash for most things	0.15	1.91*	-0.41
Get a short term loan	-0.50	1.64*	0.22
Want to have good credit	-0.25	-0.30	1.98*
Be mature (grown up)	0.12	-0.48	1.83*
Appreciate the things you are paying for	0.30	-0.16	1.50*
Not want to get in trouble	1.19*	0.30	0.37
Plan ahead of time	1.11*	-0.43	1.12*
Not want to be in debt	2.25*	0.04	-0.25

1. Avoidance
2. Living within income
3. Conservative buying

Factor Correlation Matrix

	1	2	3
1			
2	0.94		
3	0.95	0.96	

*Highest factor loadings

Table 37 (Continued)

Group Means on Original Factor Scores

Group	1	2	3
1	4.00	3.87	4.52
2	3.28	3.85	4.02
3	2.26	3.76	4.21
4	3.15	3.11	3.67

Discriminant Functions

Factors	Function 1	Function 2	Function 3
1	0.2732	-0.8481	-0.4022
2	0.9426	0.5252	-0.4485
3	0.1919	-0.0707	0.7982
4			
5			
6			
% of Variance	58.9	35.4	5.7

Group Means on Discriminant Functions

Group	Function 1	Function 2	Function 3
1	5.61	-1.68	0.26
2	5.29	-1.04	0.17
3	5.25	-1.09	0.36
4	4.50	-1.29	0.27

Overall F-ratio 1.57 (df = 9. 229) N/S

Table 38

"If you pay your bills on time, you..."

Items	Rotated Factor Matrix I	II	III
Don't have to worry	-0.16	-0.08	2.36*
Get a good credit rating	0.40	0.88	0.78
Can open charge accounts	0.51	1.00*	0.41
Keep what you've bought	0.16	1.49*	0.32
Plan how to spend what is left	0.14	2.05*	-0.56
Respect yourself	-0.24	2.06*	-0.04
Are trusted by others	0.17	2.04*	-0.49
Feel independent	-0.41	1.97*	0.27
Avoid trouble with collection agencies	-0.55	2.09*	0.39
Can buy new things	0.89	1.31*	-0.54
Are free of debt (have no money problems)	2.07*	-0.13	-0.28
Get respect from others	1.61*	0.22	-0.25
Have to go without some things you like	1.75*	-0.52	0.21
Feel relieved	0.79	0.28	0.77
Start saving for next month's bills	0.88	0.16	0.86

1. Meeting responsibilities
2. Good credit, maturity
3. No worries

Factor Correlation Matrix

	1	2	3
1			
2	0.96		
3	0.94	0.94	

*Highest factor loadings

Table 38 (Continued)

Group Means on Original Factor Scores

Group	1	2	3
1	3.79	4.06	3.88
2	3.97	3.64	2.95
3	3.94	4.03	3.11
4	3.44	3.50	2.67

Discriminant Functions

Factors	Function 1	Function 2	Function 3
1	-0.1830	0.7543	-0.5294
2	0.4836	0.4329	0.7986
3	0.8560	-0.4448	-0.2863
4			
5			
6			
% of Variance	69.7	23.5	6.80

Group Means on Discriminant Functions

Group	Function 1	Function 2	Function 3
1	4.59	3.09	0.12
2	3.56	3.44	-0.04
3	3.89	3.54	0.24
4	3.35	3.09	0.21

Overall F-ratio 2.62 (df = 9, 222) $p < .01$

POTENTIAL CONFRONTATIONS WITH LEGAL SYSTEM

Table 39

"To be robbed, you have to..."

Items	Rotated Factor Matrix I	II	III	IV	V
Be careless	-0.25	2.40*	-0.01	-0.09	-0.13
Let people know you carry money	0.48	1.57*	-0.09	0.09	0.03
Walk down an alley	1.28*	0.32	-0.19	0.04	0.06
Be unlucky	1.57*	0.16	-0.08	-0.68	0.55
Trust people	1.98*	-0.53	-0.15	0.14	0.11
Go places alone	1.34*	0.30	0.42	0.82	-1.40*
Get drunk	0.36	-0.16	1.65*	-0.18	0.29
Flash your money around	0.07	0.06	2.25*	-0.40	0.08
Have a lot of expensive things	-0.28	-0.04	2.31*	0.36	-0.22
Have friends	0.25	-0.17	0.20	2.09*	-0.38
Dress well	-0.05	0.88	0.24	0.33	1.02*
Go out of your own neighborhood	0.26	0.14	0.34	-0.02	1.58*
Lock your house	-0.10	0.06	-0.28	2.26*	0.21
Carry a gun or knife	-0.39	-0.06	0.12	1.27*	1.26*
Be tough	0.37	-0.22	-0.14	0.03	2.02*

1. Unsafe world
2. Carelessness
3. Showoff
4. Prevention
5. Bravado

Factor Correlation Matrix

	1	2	3	4	5
1					
2	0.93				
3	0.93	0.91			
4	0.57	0.84	0.85		
5	0.87	0.85	0.85	0.87	

*Highest factor loadings

Table 39 (Continued)

Group Means on Original Factor Scores

Group	1	2	3	4	5
1	2.99	2.69	2.73	1.48	1.21
2	3.90	3.18	3.03	2.30	2.88
3	3.42	2.73	3.10	1.88	1.80
4	3.18	2.45	2.52	2.33	1.93

Discriminant Functions

Factors	Function 1	Function 2	Function 3
1	0.2167	0.0506	0.1934
2	0.1455	0.3001	-0.5710
3	-0.2344	0.6337	0.6841
4	-0.0993	-0.7108	0.3871
5	0.9312	0.0253	-0.1366
6			
% of Variance	64.3	30.8	4.9

Group Means on Discriminant Functions

Group	Function 1	Function 2	Function 3
1	1.38	1.67	1.31
2	3.05	1.51	1.51
3	1.90	1.66	1.70
4	2.02	0.88	1.58

Overall F-ratio 2.23 (df = 15, 254) $p < .01$

Table 40

"If you are robbed, you..."

Items	Rotated Factor Matrix I	II	III	IV	V	VI
Are hurt	1.12*	0.41	-0.32	-0.51	0.53	0.52
Go to the police	1.91*	0.24	-0.55	0.12	-0.40	0.03
Go to the doctor for treatment	0.17	-0.22	-0.43	-0.35	0.31	2.42*
Try to collect on insurance	-0.48	0.28	0.89	0.40	-0.85	1.92*
Are more careful with your money	0.14	0.58	0.91	0.63	-0.37	0.26
Don't go out alone at night any more	-0.00	-0.11	-0.10	2.44*	0.11	-0.11
Get angry	0.12	2.23*	0.26	-0.25	-0.22	-0.16
Lose valuable things	0.01	1.46*	-0.34	0.37	0.55	0.40
Lose trust in others	0.40	0.93	-0.53	0.57	0.67	0.12
Move to a new neighborhood	0.91	-1.16*	0.21	0.39	0.48	0.70
Testify against the robber, if he is caught	1.49*	0.03	0.51	-0.20	-0.01	-0.18
Try to help the police all you can	1.68*	-0.22	0.51	0.04	-0.20	-0.28
Carry a gun	-0.14	-0.07	0.22	0.11	2.69*	-0.02
Put strong locks on your doors	-0.20	0.20	2.04*	-0.47	0.71	0.02
Only carry a little money afterwards	0.36	-0.15	1.72*	0.29	-0.15	-0.25

1. Police help
2. Anger--suspicion
3. Increased care
4. Restrict travel
5. Gun
6. Minimize loss

Factor Correlation Matrix

	1	2	3	4	5	6
1						
2	0.94					
3	0.94	0.91				
4	0.92	0.90	0.91			
5	0.85	0.81	0.82	0.81		
6	0.94	0.90	0.90	0.89	0.84	

Table 40 (Continued)

Group Means on Original Factor Scores

Group	1	2	3	4	5	6
1	4.42	3.28	3.09	2.87	0.69	2.93
2	3.80	2.71	2.22	2.76	1.43	2.71
3	4.55	3.35	3.27	2.49	2.19	2.77
4	3.86	2.42	2.76	2.43	1.84	3.28

Discriminant Functions

Factors	Function 1	Function 2	Function 3
1	0.0106	0.3930	-0.0019
2	0.0548	0.5682	0.1617
3	0.1897	0.1899	-0.6694
4	-0.3994	-0.1364	0.2581
5	0.8613	-0.2852	0.2400
6	-0.2442	-0.6219	-0.6337
% of Variance	56.0	31.7	12.3

Group Means on Discriminant Functions

Group	Function 1	Function 2	Function 3
1	-0.45	1.78	-2.49
2	0.07	0.99	-1.72
3	1.07	1.62	-2.24
4	0.51	0.53	-2.47

Overall F-ratio 4.16 (df = 18, 249) p < .01

Table 41

"To get arrested, you have to..."

Items	Rotated Factor Matrix I	II	III	IV	V
Be someplace at the wrong time	1.82*	1.22*	-0.14	-0.79	0.02
Get drunk	1.38*	0.05	-0.23	0.15	1.07*
Run from the police	1.92*	-0.66	0.15	-0.09	0.56
Have a "bad name" with the police	1.76*	-0.44	-0.19	0.65	-0.76
Hurt someone	0.66	-0.18	1.47*	-0.19	-0.06
Not care about what you do	0.59	-0.14	1.32*	0.18	-0.58
Let someone see you doing something wrong	0.49	0.55	0.48	0.63	-0.70
Steal something	0.07	0.34	1.06*	0.71	-0.75
Get "high" on drugs	-0.57	0.26	1.94*	-0.09	0.55
"Look guilty" to a policeman	-0.32	2.08*	0.19	+0.00	0.17
Make a mistake	0.41	0.96	-0.82	1.38*	-0.43
Fight	-0.14	-0.12	0.40	1.34*	0.03
Gamble	-0.17	-0.42	0.18	1.81*	0.14
Be on the corner	-0.16	0.14	-0.39	1.43*	1.20*
Break a traffic law	0.17	0.18	0.54	0.06	1.76*

1. Bad name--guilty acts
2. Coincidence--overeager cops
3. Drug-related acts
4. Hanging out
5. Minor violations

Factor Correlation Matrix

	1	2	3	4	5
1					
2	0.91				
3	0.94	0.92			
4	0.94	0.92	0.94		
5	0.75	0.74	0.75	0.77	

*Highest factor loadings

Table 41 (Continued)

Group Means on Original Factor Scores

Group	1	2	3	4	5
1	2.94	2.60	3.45	3.28	0.67
2	3.42	2.45	3.29	3.42	1.14
3	3.38	2.92	3.70	3.88	1.40
4	2.88	2.31	3.02	2.98	1.16

Discriminant Functions

Factors	Function 1	Function 2	Function 3
1	0.0380	-0.6057	-0.6806
2	0.4450	0.2949	0.2971
3	0.3835	0.4207	0.0864
4	0.8084	-0.0164	-0.0946
5	0.0067	-0.6074	0.6574
6			
% of Variance	53.8	28.7	17.4

Group Means on Discriminant Functions

Group	Function 1	Function 2	Function 3
1	5.25	-0.02	-0.80
2	5.26	-0.71	-0.89
3	5.99	-0.54	-0.56
4	4.71	-0.55	-0.53

Overall F-ratio 1.01 (df = 15, 254) N/S

Table 42

"If you get arrested, you..."

	Rotated Factor Matrix				
Items	I	II	III	IV	V
Go to jail	0.39	2.21*	-0.03	-0.27	-0.13
Have a police record	0.08	2.17*	-0.02	0.15	-0.21
Put up bail money	-0.59	1.85*	-0.01	0.21	0.63
Feel guilty	-0.28	-0.08	0.11	2.17*	-0.31
Are embarrassed	0.11	0.13	-0.28	1.85*	-0.04
Make your family unhappy	0.19	0.35	0.04	0.96	0.55
Have to find money for a lawyer	-0.37	0.09	0.41	-0.20	2.18*
Call your family for help	0.42	-0.03	-0.06	-0.24	2.00*
Stop doing whatever got you arrested	0.31	-0.53	-0.29	0.96	1.24*
Get beaten by the police	-0.16	-0.05	2.31*	-0.13	0.25
Are put on probation	0.28	0.17	1.22*	0.66	-0.35
Have trouble getting a job	1.19*	-0.20	-0.11	0.36	0.44
Try to tell the police you are innocent	2.01*	0.13	-0.44	-0.02	0.14
Tell all your friends what happened	2.04*	0.11	0.08	-0.31	-0.08
Are always being watched	1.31*	-0.09	0.93	0.16	-0.51

1. Bad future consequences
2. Legal consequences
3. Beating
4. Guilt
5. Get help

Factor Correlation Matrix

	1	2	3	4	5
1					
2	0.93				
3	0.90	0.88			
4	0.94	0.93	0.90		
5	0.93	0.92	0.88	0.94	

*Highest factor loadings

Table 42 (Continued)

Group Means on Original Factor Scores

Group	1	2	3	4	5
1	3.28	3.25	1.94	3.91	3.53
2	3.20	2.90	2.89	3.72	3.09
3	3.80	3.57	2.21	3.35	3.29
4	2.90	2.29	2.02	2.91	3.15

Discriminant Functions

Factors	Function 1	Function 2	Function 3
1	0.4333	-0.2234	0.4313
2	0.8193	0.1604	-0.0391
3	-0.3404	0.7087	0.5339
4	-0.1549	0.5268	-0.6870
5	-0.0331	-0.3803	-0.2355
6			
% of Variance	60.5	23.9	15.6

Group Means on Discriminant Functions

Group	Function 1	Function 2	Function 3
1	2.70	1.88	-1.19
2	2.10	2.58	-0.47
3	3.19	1.80	-0.39
4	1.89	1.49	-0.50

Overall F-ratio 3.65 (df = 15, 246) $p < .01$

Table 43

"To get drunk, you have to..."

	Rotated Factor Matrix					
Items	I	II	III	IV	V	VI
Be curious about what it is like	-0.43	0.35	0.05	0.28	0.04	2.04*
Want to have a good time	0.21	0.19	-1.21*	0.53	0.67	0.64
Have a lot of problems	0.05	-0.17	0.02	-0.21	1.48*	0.42
Have the money to buy liquor	-0.17	-0.23	0.08	-0.07	2.21*	-0.04
Want to be "cool"	0.18	0.65	0.04	0.34	1.02*	-0.89
Have nothing to do the next day	0.27	0.91	1.18*	0.09	0.48	-0.55
Work hard that day	-0.21	2.18*	0.15	-0.05	-0.28	0.25
Be with friends	0.75	1.01*	-0.82	0.11	0.10	-0.01
Look for excitement	1.51*	0.74	-0.36	-0.38	-0.09	-0.02
Not know what your limit is	1.79*	-0.66	0.39	0.31	-0.17	-0.22
Go to a party	-0.27	0.62	-0.15	1.59*	0.05	-0.21
Want to feel good	0.42	-0.60	-0.27	1.59*	0.17	0.08
Have something to celebrate	-0.03	-0.10	0.43	1.79*	-0.36	0.23
Be unhappy about something	0.20	0.10	1.78*	0.21	0.19	0.50
Have friends who drink a lot	0.86	-0.14	0.24	-0.45	0.09	1.53*

1. Excitement
2. Relaxation
3. Sadness
4. Celebration
5. Problems--opportunity
6. Curiosity--social motives

Factor Correlation Matrix

	1	2	3	4	5	6
1						
2	0.93					
3	0.65	0.67				
4	0.95	0.92	0.66			
5	0.94	0.91	0.65	0.94		
6	0.90	0.85	0.59	0.90	0.91	

*Highest factor loadings

Table 43 (Continued)

Group Means on Original Factor Scores

Group	1	2	3	4	5	6
1	3.81	2.28	0.88	3.45	3.50	2.75
2	3.28	3.04	1.17	3.49	3.46	2.49
3	3.65	2.59	0.76	3.55	3.80	2.47
4	3.89	2.93	0.86	3.68	3.08	2.06

Discriminant Functions

Factors	Function 1	Function 2	Function 3
1	-0.4544	0.5984	-0.2047
2	-0.2442	-0.7073	0.2132
3	0.0994	-0.2982	-0.4196
4	-0.2915	-0.0490	0.2585
5	0.7057	0.1261	0.5587
6	0.3755	-0.1857	-0.5980
% of Variance	53.2	37.6	9.22

Group Means on Discriminant Functions

Group	Function 1	Function 2	Function 3
1	0.30	0.17	0.54
2	0.24	-0.73	0.84
3	0.36	-0.03	1.05
4	-0.52	-0.18	0.90

Overall F-ratio 1.74 (df = 18, 258) $p < .05$

Table 44

"If you get drunk, you..."

Items	I	II
Feel sick	0.98	1.18*
Get into an accident	-0.34	2.42*
Feel embarrassed	-0.16	2.26*
Are hung over the next day	0.54	1.92*
Relax more	2.26*	0.05
Feel happy	2.57*	-0.16
Have a good time	2.62*	-0.19
Lose others' respect	0.12	1.91*
Get arrested	-0.29	2.13*
Mess up your clothes	0.17	1.98*
Do silly things	0.98	1.40*
Get robbed	-0.60	2.52*
Get into a fight	0.06	1.91*
Laugh about it with your friends the next day	2.50*	-0.09
Miss work	0.04	2.13*

1. Good time

2. Bad consequences

Factor Correlation Matrix

	1	2
1		
2	0.92	

*Highest factor loadings

Table 44 (Continued)

Group Means on Original Factor Scores

Group	1	2
1	2.61	1.95
2	2.45	2.55
3	2.48	2.59
4	2.40	2.49

Discriminant Functions

Factors	Function 1
1	-0.4036
2	0.9150
3	
4	
5	
6	
% of Variance	96.8

Group Means on Discriminant Functions

Group	Function 1	Function 2
1	0.73	-3.01
2	1.34	-3.01
3	1.37	-3.05
4	1.31	-2.94

Overall F-ratio 1.58 (df = 6, 184) N/S

Table 45

"To gamble, you have to..."

Items	Rotated Factor Matrix I	II	III	IV	V	VI
Have money	0.30	-0.02	-0.37	-0.13	0.26	2.43*
Know how to play the games (poker, craps, pool, etc.)	0.02	-0.43	0.42	0.40	-0.35	1.72*
Know where the action is	-0.11	0.32	0.22	0.54	-0.47	1.35*
Not have anything else to do	1.24*	0.22	1.01*	0.06	-0.06	-0.69
Have a good idea what the odds on things are	-0.23	-0.10	1.43*	-0.07	0.09	0.16
Want to have excitement	-0.13	-0.08	1.76*	-0.00	0.70	-0.80
Not care if you lose	0.07	-0.05	0.06	0.20	2.32*	0.11
Be willing to take a chance	-0.64	0.48	0.48	-0.49	0.90	1.34*
Be looking for "something for nothing"	0.05	2.60*	-0.02	-0.03	-0.03	-0.02
Have nerve ("guts")	0.98*	-0.25	1.23*	-1.27*	-0.02	0.58
Have friends who gamble	-0.28	0.38	0.87	0.83	0.10	-0.14
Not care about your family's welfare	2.30*	0.07	-0.23	0.13	0.10	0.21
Expect to win	-0.36	0.06	1.61*	0.30	-1.04*	0.35
Think it is the only way to get a lot of money	0.59	0.21	-0.14	1.86*	-0.09	0.13
Be able to borrow the money you need	-0.06	-0.37	0.29	1.99*	0.39	0.04

1. Uncaring, boredom
2. Something for nothing
3. Positive expectancy
4. Need for money
5. Negative expectancy
6. Practical considerations

Factor Correlation Matrix

	1	2	3	4	5	6
1						
2	0.79					
3	0.87	0.90				
4	0.84	0.80	0.86			
5	0.77	0.76	0.82	0.71		
6	0.85	0.87	0.96	0.83	0.79	

*Highest factor loadings

Table 45 (Continued)

Group Means on Original Factor Scores

Group	1	2	3	4	5	6
1	1.69	2.49	4.14	1.46	1.72	3.45
2	2.35	2.10	4.05	2.11	1.07	3.04
3	2.03	2.04	4.63	1.90	1.58	3.84
4	1.85	1.80	3.91	1.68	1.53	3.05

Discriminant Functions

Factors	Function 1	Function 2	Function 3
1	-0.2504	-0.5667	-0.1606
2	-0.0820	0.1510	-0.9100
3	0.1197	-0.2680	0.2286
4	-0.1477	-0.2818	0.2183
5	0.4466	0.5971	0.1730
6	0.8337	-0.3852	-0.1274
% of Variance	59.4	27.7	12.9

Group Means on Discriminant Functions

Group	Function 1	Function 2	Function 3
1	3.30	-2.40	-1.41
2	2.42	-3.23	-1.10
3	3.51	-3.16	-0.92
4	2.83	-2.56	-0.80

Overall F-ratio 1.80 (df = 18, 258) $p < .05$

Table 46

"If you gamble, you..."

	Rotated Factor Matrix					
Items	I	II	III	IV	V	VI
Lose your money	0.10	+0.00	-0.05	2.09*	0.16	0.16
Make enemies	0.10	0.20	0.22	1.71*	0.20	-0.16
Get arrested	0.35	0.15	0.90	0.74	0.31	-0.69
Have fun	-0.16	-0.06	-0.39	0.27	2.11*	0.47
Win a lot of money	-0.03	0.69	-0.08	0.17	1.16*	0.11
Make your family go without things	-0.76	1.14*	0.98	0.25	-0.30	0.13
Steal to make up your losses	-1.01*	1.18*	0.43	-0.09	0.65	0.07
Get "hooked" on it and can't quit	0.20	2.34*	-0.47	-0.01	-0.18	-0.17
Have excitement in your life	0.78	0.89	0.49	-1.20*	0.89	-0.10
Get hurt if you can't pay	1.94*	0.19	0.04	0.09	-0.01	0.17
Have a more exciting life	0.56	-0.50	0.86	-0.19	1.51*	-0.41
Argue with your family	0.03	-0.45	2.02*	-0.02	-0.24	-0.05
Have to borrow money	0.75	0.80	0.62	0.19	-1.12*	0.72
Quit while you're ahead	0.38	0.02	-0.43	0.22	0.17	2.31*
Get in with a tough crowd	-0.49	-0.30	0.89	-0.30	0.09	1.87*

1. Bad consequences (self)
2. Bad consequences (family
3. Family troubles
4. Loss of money--friends
5. Fun-winning
6. Toughness

Factor Correlation Matrix

	1	2	3	4	5	6
1						
2	0.86					
3	0.89	0.94				
4	0.88	0.88	0.90			
5	0.85	0.91	0.91	0.86		
6	0.86	0.85	0.89	0.86	0.85	

*Highest factor loadings

Table 46 (Continued)

Group Means on Original Factor Scores

Group	1	2	3	4	5	6
1	2.16	2.06	2.70	2.42	1.96	2.18
2	2.40	3.41	3.47	2.94	2.69	1.72
3	2.51	2.99	3.78	2.40	2.69	2.50
4	1.87	2.84	3.27	2.11	2.40	2.14

Discriminant Functions

Factors	Function 1	Function 2	Function 3
1	0.1169	-0.2735	0.7311
2	0.5002	-0.3784	-0.4149
3	-0.2609	-0.4350	-0.0984
4	0.5101	0.4252	0.4773
5	0.0999	-0.4411	0.0824
6	-0.6309	-0.4662	0.2217
% of Variance	46.4	37.5	16.1

Group Means on Discriminant Functions

Group	Function 1	Function 2	Function 3
1	0.63	-3.40	2.26
2	1.76	-4.19	2.00
3	0.71	-4.80	2.14
4	0.75	-4.17	1.54

Overall F-ratio 2.25 (df = 18, 252) $p < .01$

Table 47

"To use drugs (any illegal drugs), you have to..."

Items	Rotated Factor Matrix I	II	III	IV	V
Not be able to handle your problems	-0.25	0.00	-0.08	0.13	2.24*
Want to "find" yourself	0.36	-0.39	0.30	-0.26	2.13*
Want some kicks	0.26	0.60	-0.27	0.25	1.42*
Feel inferior	0.23	-0.30	2.42*	-0.09	0.04
Have money	1.87*	0.64	0.21	-0.17	0.23
Have a connection (somebody to supply them)	0.78	0.51	0.21	1.05*	-0.31
Have nerve (guts)	1.13*	-0.17	0.33	1.13*	-0.19
Have people telling you how good drugs are	0.07	-0.39	0.70	1.46*	-0.07
Have to know how to use the different kinds of drugs	0.49	-0.54	-0.03	2.25*	-0.35
Have a safe place to take them	-0.15	-0.04	-0.43	1.90*	0.45
Be curious about them	-0.50	0.39	-0.35	1.77*	0.31
Have drugs easily available to you	-0.91	0.51	0.11	1.84*	-0.04
Be unhappy with your life	-1.08*	1.15*	1.43*	0.08	0.14
Have friends who use drugs	-0.04	2.02*	0.25	-0.15	-0.08
Want new experiences	0.38	2.42*	-0.41	-0.02	-0.14

1. Experimentation
2. Change life
3. Compensation
4. Practicality
5. Improve life

Factor Correlation Matrix

	1	2	3	4	5
1					
2	0.84				
3	0.82	0.90			
4	0.87	0.92	0.91		
5	0.84	0.87	0.89	0.91	

*Highest factor loadings

Table 47 (Continued)

Group Means on Original Factor Scores

Group	1	2	3	4	5
1	2.15	3.35	2.51	3.73	2.50
2	1.70	2.09	2.91	3.45	2.38
3	1.67	2.98	2.66	3.19	2.83
4	1.97	2.30	2.19	2.86	2.10

Discriminant Functions

Factors	Function 1	Function 2	Function 3
1	-0.1081	-0.6215	-0.1147
2	0.7886	-0.1604	-0.1590
3	-0.3758	0.5263	0.0667
4	-0.2946	0.1325	-0.8658
5	0.3722	0.5417	0.4556
6			
% of Variance	61.2	28.2	10.6

Group Means on Discriminant Functions

Group	Function 1	Function 2	Function 3
1	1.30	1.30	-2.70
2	0.24	1.88	-2.24
3	1.28	1.84	-1.96
4	0.72	1.08	-1.97

Overall F-ratio 3.02 (df = 15, 252) $p < .01$

Table 48

"If you use drugs (any illegal drug), you..."

Items	Rotated Factor Matrix I	II	III	IV	V	VI
Get hooked	-0.32	0.26	0.48	-0.48	0.17	1.27*
Lose respect for yourself	-0.18	-0.38	0.11	-0.02	-0.13	2.10*
Don't feel safe	0.26	0.63	-0.47	0.27	-0.34	1.44*
Get high	-0.50	1.77*	0.53	0.25	-0.14	0.11
Try to get others to use them	-0.08	1.87*	0.31	-0.11	0.06	-0.49
Escape from your problems	1.00*	1.34*	-0.65	-1.44*	0.53	0.13
Become unreliable	0.04	1.05*	-0.17	0.70	-0.36	0.71
Get arrested	0.95	0.19	-0.52	0.43	0.65	0.29
Hurt your body	0.41	0.27	-0.08	2.05*	0.30	0.01
Feel sick	-0.09	0.10	-0.52	0.25	1.52*	0.23
Spend all your money on them	-0.18	0.11	0.37	0.08	2.05*	-0.52
Lose others' respect	-0.16	-0.41	0.10	-0.10	1.41*	0.84
Feel good	0.13	0.18	2.53*	0.08	0.10	0.02
Understand things better	2.26*	-0.58	0.85	-0.27	0.09	0.46
Improve your life	2.81*	0.17	-0.16	0.24	-0.24	-0.35

1. Mental improvement
2. Being a "head"
3. Feeling
4. Health
5. Bad outcomes--spend money
6. Lose self-respect--security

Factor Correlation Matrix

	1	2	3	4	5	6
1						
2	0.84					
3	0.80	0.85				
4	0.68	0.83	0.68			
5	0.83	0.94	0.81	0.86		
6	0.80	0.94	0.81	0.86	0.94	

*Highest factor loadings

Table 48 (Continued)

Group Means on Original Factor Scores

Group	1	2	3	4	5	6
1	1.09	3.06	1.28	1.87	2.65	3.34
2	2.47	3.40	1.72	1.43	3.40	2.64
3	1.35	4.12	2.02	1.99	3.86	3.64
4	2.12	3.03	1.61	1.65	3.21	3.24

Discriminant Functions

Factors	Function 1	Function 2	Function 3
1	0.9401	0.0522	0.2588
2	-0.2516	0.5019	-0.4838
3	-0.1353	0.2903	0.3540
4	-0.0208	-0.1264	0.0570
5	0.1266	0.6451	0.1609
6	-0.1346	-0.4785	0.7379
% of Variance	63.3	32.0	4.69

Group Means on Discriminant Functions

Group	Function 1	Function 2	Function 3
1	-0.07	1.84	2.26
2	1.28	3.09	2.18
3	-0.08	3.23	2.49
4	0.95	2.41	2.65

Overall F-ratio 4.35 (df = 18, 249) $p < .01$

Table 49

"To steal, you have to..."

Items	Rotated Factor Matrix					
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI
Need money	-0.02	2.43*	0.09	0.05	-0.05	-0.18
Want to make easy money	1.41*	0.06	0.10	0.64	0.29	-0.39
Have the chance to do it	2.28*	-0.05	-0.09	-0.14	+0.00	0.11
Get a gun	0.36	-0.06	-0.06	-0.17	1.59*	-0.19
Have somebody to help you	0.01	-0.23	0.57	-0.29	1.90*	-0.48
See something you want	0.44	0.41	-0.52	-0.24	0.87	1.02*
Be too lazy to work	-0.37	0.56	-0.79	0.55	1.19*	0.72
Have low morals	-0.27	0.15	-0.18	1.01*	0.64	0.51
Not care if you get caught	0.02	0.27	-0.14	2.08*	-0.25	-0.13
Not be able to get a job	-0.04	-0.46	0.51	1.62*	-0.02	0.12
Have friends that steal	-0.10	-0.11	1.87*	0.48	0.31	-0.55
Have enough nerve	0.66	0.62	1.43*	-0.18	-0.79	0.62
Want to see if you can do it	0.14	-0.50	0.82	0.18	0.27	0.95
Be stupid	-0.54	0.36	1.60*	-0.47	0.49	0.48
Want to "prove yourself"	-0.00	-0.25	0.01	-0.02	-0.26	2.40*

1. Motive and opportunity
2. Poverty
3. Social pressure
4. Need--lack of conscience
5. Practicality
6. Bravado

Factor Correlation Matrix

	1	2	3	4	5	6
1						
2	0.90					
3	0.91	0.87				
4	0.92	0.89	0.91			
5	0.92	0.90	0.92	0.93		
6	0.91	0.88	0.90	0.91	0.91	

*Highest factor loadings

Table 49 (Continued)

Group Means on Original Factor Scores

Group	1	2	3	4	5	6
1	3.32	2.93	2.89	3.28	2.97	2.61
2	2.60	2.18	3.01	3.24	3.37	2.38
3	3.36	2.47	2.80	3.04	3.27	2.96
4	2.54	2.25	2.34	2.84	2.75	2.63

Discriminant Functions

Factors	Function 1	Function 2	Function 3
1	0.6892	0.4200	-0.1807
2	0.3552	0.1023	0.6470
3	-0.2504	0.6379	0.0834
4	-0.2399	0.0806	0.3950
5	-0.3530	0.2239	-0.5294
6	0.3925	-0.5913	-0.3250
% of Variance	57.7	26.8	15.5

Group Means on Discriminant Functions

Group	Function 1	Function 2	Function 3
1	1.80	2.92	0.41
2	0.78	2.84	-0.09
3	1.78	2.68	-0.27
4	1.34	2.08	0.01

Overall F-ratio 1.77 (df = 18, 258) $p < .05$

Table 50

"If you steal, you..."

Items	I	II	III	IV	V	VI
Get caught	-0.12	0.10	0.09	0.05	0.48	1.94*
Feel guilty	0.11	-0.14	0.19	1.29*	-0.24	1.29*
Steal again	0.52	1.14*	-1.60	0.09	0.54	0.40
Lose self-respect	-0.26	0.15	-0.21	1.88*	0.05	0.31
Are afraid of getting caught	0.07	-0.16	0.01	2.34*	-0.04	-0.14
Have the money you need to live	1.84*	0.03	-0.92	0.71	-0.59	0.18
Get sent to prison	-0.13	1.38*	-0.08	-0.43	-0.19	0.81
Hide from the police	-0.18	1.91*	-0.12	-0.18	-0.20	-0.15
Ruin your chance for a good life, if you're caught	-0.36	1.32*	1.01*	0.56	-0.42	-0.57
Get hurt by the police	0.66	0.33	0.89	-0.68	0.21	0.94
Make your family feel bad	0.42	0.22	2.02*	-0.05	-0.04	0.46
Can buy the things you want	2.22*	-0.18	0.55	-0.41	0.12	-0.22
Feel like you've gotten away with something	0.61	0.80	0.11	0.43	0.89	-1.23*
Lose friends' respect, if they find out	0.07	0.14	1.07*	1.09*	0.60	-0.39
Brag about it	-0.11	-0.12	-0.08	-0.02	2.71*	0.11

1. Good outcomes (money)
2. Bad outcomes (punishment)
3. Lose others' respect
4. Guilt--fear
5. Brag
6. Guilt--capture

Factor Correlation Matrix

	1	2	3	4	5	6
1						
2	0.94					
3	0.80	0.85				
4	0.91	0.94	0.85			
5	0.84	0.85	0.71	0.81		
6	0.85	0.90	0.76	0.88	0.79	

*Highest factor loadings

Table 50 (Continued)

Group Means on Original Factor Scores

Group	1	2	3	4	5	6
1	2.56	3.63	2.29	3.70	1.17	2.32
2	3.14	3.96	1.68	2.79	1.89	1.99
3	2.88	4.38	1.90	3.01	1.98	2.11
4	2.70	3.64	1.09	2.82	1.58	2.17

Discriminant Functions

Factors	Function 1	Function 2	Function 3
1	0.0490	-0.0298	0.7881
2	0.5027	0.3095	-0.5171
3	-0.4265	0.8143	0.2711
4	-0.6273	-0.1496	-0.1908
5	0.3178	0.4037	-0.0293
6	-0.2617	-0.2343	-0.0284
% of Variance	63.3	30.8	5.9

Group Means on Discriminant Functions

Group	Function 1	Function 2	Function 3
1	-1.58	2.29	-0.04
2	-0.24	2.38	0.24
3	-0.28	2.67	-0.17
4	-0.33	1.64	-0.11

Overall F-ratio 2.49 (df = 18, 249) $p < .01$

ASPECTS OF INTERPERSONAL RELATIONS

Table 51

"To not be dependent on others, you have to..."

Items	Rotated Factor Matrix I	II	III	IV
Have money	-0.23	1.97*	0.06	0.09
Have a skill	-0.62	1.18*	0.28	0.94
Believe in yourself	0.53	0.50	0.92	0.98
Be a leader	-0.19	+0.00	0.57	1.08*
Be able to help other people	+0.00	0.26	-0.25	1.61*
Do what you want	-0.45	0.16	0.66	1.43*
Not ask for favors	0.66	-0.63	0.06	1.43*
Have your own car	0.15	0.60	-0.71	1.54*
Be yourself	1.78*	-0.69	0.18	0.47
Have good friends	0.96	0.14	-0.46	1.04*
Be proud	1.87*	0.27	-0.14	-0.25
Have a good job	0.81	1.32*	-0.33	0.07
Have your own ideas	1.15*	1.10*	0.82	-1.06*
Like yourself	0.37	0.16	2.16*	-0.56
Feel safe	-0.45	-0.07	2.00*	0.57

1. Emotional independence
2. Financial independence
3. Security
4. Social conformity

Factor Correlation Matrix

	1	2	3	4
1				
2	0.94			
3	0.94	0.92		
4	0.95	0.95	0.94	

*Highest factor loadings

Table 51 (Continued)

Group Means on Original Factor Scores

Group	1	2	3	4
1	3.87	3.10	3.76	3.51
2	3.44	3.40	3.10	4.38
3	3.53	3.23	3.07	3.40
4	3.82	3.01	3.21	3.47

Discriminant Functions

Factors	Function 1	Function 2	Function 3
1	-0.4896	-0.1769	-0.6095
2	0.0269	0.5589	0.4764
3	-0.3073	-0.6834	0.5902
4	0.8155	-0.4351	-0.2309
5			
6			
% of Variance	78.5	15.6	5.9

Group Means on Discriminant Functions

Group	Function 1	Function 2	Function 3
1	-0.10	-3.05	0.52
2	1.03	-2.74	0.34
3	0.19	-2.39	0.41
4	0.06	-2.70	0.19

Overall F-ratio 2.40 (df = 12, 246) $p < .01$

Table 52

"If you are not dependent on others, you..."

Items	Rotated Factor Matrix			
	I	II	III	IV
Stay out as late as you like	0.69	0.30	0.28	0.71
Have a job	-0.21	0.23	1.53*	0.06
Pay your bills	0.11	0.81	0.76	0.15
Are married	0.02	-0.17	-0.02	2.32*
Can "do your own thing"	-0.02	1.07*	-0.03	0.97
Learn to understand other people	0.23	0.84	0.05	0.69
Help others	-0.18	1.70*	-0.17	0.10
Make your own decisions	0.07	1.58*	0.04	0.10
Sometimes can't get help when you need it	2.17*	0.68	-1.02*	0.10
Believe in yourself	0.28	1.86*	0.06	-0.83
Are sometimes left out of things	1.94*	0.18	0.23	-0.58
Have personal satisfaction	0.64	0.00	1.42*	-0.43
Don't have many close friends	1.99*	-1.14*	0.74	0.42
Are mature (grown up)	-0.24	-0.12	1.88*	0.06
Accept your responsibilities	-0.21	1.01*	0.76	0.15

1. Lonely
2. Independence
3. Maturity
4. Married

Factor Correlation Matrix

	1	2	3	4
1				
2	0.94			
3	0.93	0.96		
4	0.90	0.92	0.91	

*Highest factor loadings

Table 52 (Continued)

Group Means on Original Factor Scores

Group	1	2	3	4
1	2.83	4.53	4.23	2.51
2	3.54	4.02	3.87	2.56
3	3.17	3.81	3.62	2.49
4	2.77	3.96	3.34	2.48

Discriminant Functions

Factors	Function 1	Function 2
1	-0.8777	0.3560
2	0.4734	0.3360
3	0.0238	0.8214
4	-0.0703	-0.2927
5		
6		
% of Variance	64.3	33.0

Group Means on Discriminant Functions

Group	Function 1	Function 2
1	-0.41	5.27
2	-1.29	5.04
3	-1.07	4.65
4	-0.65	4.33

Overall F-ratio 1.81 (df = 12, 238) $p < .05$

Table 53

"To be respected and admired by others, you have to..."

Items	Rotated Factor Matrix I	II	III
Do something better than most people can	-0.09	2.35*	0.16
Be kind to others	2.16*	0.78	-0.33
Respect yourself	2.65*	0.10	0.16
Like other people	2.68*	-0.16	0.44
Be willing to help others	3.17*	-0.72	0.22
Be honest	2.83*	-0.76	1.02*
Act "cool," but not stuck-up	2.27*	-0.53	0.86
Have a lot of money	0.17	0.32	2.45*
Be smarter than most other people	-0.08	1.43*	1.39*
Be thoughtful of others	2.77*	0.06	-0.38
Respect other people	2.88*	0.39	-0.37
Be modest	2.30*	-0.25	0.66
Be trustworthy	2.66*	0.41	-0.53
Act friendly to others	2.56*	0.41	-0.39
Be generous with what you have	1.88*	0.80	-0.44

1. Good friend
2. Better skills
3. Money and intelligence

Factor Correlation Matrix

	1	2	3
1			
2	0.92		
3	0.73	0.81	

*Highest factor loadings

Table 53 (Continued)

Group Means on Original Factor Scores

Group	1	2	3
1	2.95	2.00	0.89
2	2.49	2.88	1.73
3	2.60	2.82	1.37
4	2.36	2.28	1.47

Discriminant Functions

Factors	Function 1	Function 2
1	-0.7159	-0.7110
2	0.6189	-0.6090
3	0.3232	0.3514
4		
5		
6		
% of Variance	70.6	27.2

Group Means on Discriminant Functions

Group	Function 1	Function 2
1	-0.59	-3.00
2	0.56	-2.92
3	0.33	-3.08
4	0.20	-2.55

Overall F-ratio 2.82 (df = 9, 229) $p < .01$

Table 54

"If people respect and admire you, you..."

Items	Rotated Factor Matrix I	II	III	IV
Feel proud	0.01	-0.48	0.17	1.78*
Care more about people's feelings	0.12	0.15	0.33	1.30*
Are concerned about other people	0.14	0.15	0.35	1.22*
Are happy	0.02	-0.01	-0.16	1.85*
Believe in yourself	-0.20	0.01	-0.25	2.09*
Want to live up to it	-0.14	0.05	-0.17	1.94*
Get stuck-up (think you're better than other people)	-0.22	2.28*	0.75	-0.51
Can go to others for favors	0.01	0.18	2.05*	-0.27
Want to succeed even more	-0.02	-0.49	1.46*	0.69
Try to help other people when they need it	-0.28	0.20	0.19	1.58*
Aren't free to do anything you want	0.09	2.41*	-0.56	0.40
Feel safer	1.01*	0.16	-0.08	0.71
Think that things will work out the way you want	0.63	0.76	-0.06	0.66
Can borrow money easier	1.75*	-0.13	0.36	-0.17
Are a better person	2.18*	-0.05	-0.18	-0.10

1. Trust and security
2. Snobbery
3. Help and ambition
4. Pride--responsibility

Factor Correlation Matrix

	1	2	3	4
1				
2	0.88			
3	0.93	0.89		
4	0.95	0.90	0.95	

*Highest factor loadings

Table 54 (Continued)

Group Means on Original Factor Scores

Group	1	2	3	4
1	3.44	1.90	3.41	4.58
2	3.45	2.33	3.05	3.77
3	3.38	2.14	3.43	4.21
4	3.02	2.18	3.35	3.71

Discriminant Functions

Factors	Function 1	Function 2
1	-0.1422	-0.6934
2	-0.3816	-0.2633
3	-0.0890	0.6688
4	0.9090	-0.0514
5		
6		
% of Variance	74.9	23.6

Group Means on Discriminant Functions

Group	Function 1	Function 2
1	2.64	-0.84
2	1.77	-1.15
3	2.23	-0.83
4	1.82	-0.61

Overall F-ratio 1.40 (df = 12, 241) N/S

Table 55

"To have good friends, you have to..."

Items	Rotated Factor Matrix			
	I	II	III	IV
Be reliable	0.10	0.30	1.09*	0.60
Be honest	-0.58	0.12	2.02*	0.23
Be a good friend to others	0.22	0.37	1.35*	0.01
Be respected	0.37	0.17	1.22*	0.14
Be loyal	0.12	-0.15	1.76*	-0.10
Be helpful	0.66	-0.01	1.40*	-0.57
Listen to their ideas	1.89*	0.39	-0.06	-0.47
Choose friends wisely	1.94*	0.07	-0.03	-0.33
Go a lot of places with them	1.64*	-1.02*	0.54	0.19
Keep others' secrets	2.00*	+0.00	-0.07	-0.34
Be smart	1.20*	-0.85	0.15	1.21*
Do things for them	1.66*	0.67	-0.90	0.79
Have money	-0.21	0.10	0.02	2.57*
Share what you have	0.40	1.80*	-0.17	0.18
Respect them	-0.04	2.09*	0.29	0.03

1. Trustworthiness
2. Respect
3. Dependability
4. Usefulness to others

Factor Correlation Matrix

	1	2	3	4
1				
2	0.91			
3	0.96	0.93		
4	0.90	0.85	0.90	

*Highest factor loadings

Table 55 (Continued)

Group Means on Original Factor Scores

Group	1	2	3	4
1	4.14	3.51	4.48	1.33
2	3.91	2.27	4.09	2.72
3	3.48	2.50	3.76	2.18
4	3.26	2.25	3.55	2.06

Discriminant Functions

Factors	Function 1	Function 2
1	0.0917	-0.7330
2	0.5405	0.1813
3	0.0620	-0.5938
4	-0.8341	-0.2779
5		
6		
% of Variance	80.5	18.9

Group Means on Discriminant Functions

Group	Function 1	Function 2
1	1.44	-5.43
2	-0.43	-5.64
3	0.09	-4.93
4	0.02	-4.66

Overall F-ratio 3.64 (df = 12, 246) $p < .01$

Table 56

"If you have good friends, you..."

Items	Rotated Factor Matrix I	II	III	IV
Have someone to help if you need it	0.98	0.59	0.28	-0.06
Do things together	1.24*	0.36	0.12	0.14
Have fun	2.00*	0.10	-0.37	-0.20
Help them if they need it	1.84*	-0.38	0.04	-0.11
Give things to each other	1.75*	-0.59	0.05	0.25
Trust them	1.12*	0.43	0.24	0.06
Feel safe	0.37	-0.05	1.13*	0.23
Feel good	0.19	0.59	1.14*	-0.32
Are proud of yourself	-0.05	-0.47	1.89*	-0.22
Share what you have	-0.00	-0.06	1.61*	-0.24
Are loyal to them	-0.05	0.71	1.41*	-0.66
Aren't lonely	-0.11	2.48*	-0.13	0.14
Get respect	-0.42	-0.40	1.66*	0.87
Get in trouble together	-0.03	0.11	-0.08	2.75*
Depend on them	0.28	0.26	0.46	1.14*

1. Fun and mutual helping
2. "Togetherness"
3. Pride--security
4. Help with forbidden acts

Factor Correlation Matrix

	1	2	3	4
1				
2	0.92			
3	0.97	0.93		
4	0.88	0.86	0.87	

*Highest factor loadings

Table 56 (Continued)

Group Means on Original Factor Scores

Group	1	2	3	4
1	5.17	3.45	5.29	1.54
2	4.45	2.72	4.29	2.35
3	4.37	2.68	4.40	2.03
4	3.84	2.24	4.04	1.86

Discriminant Functions

Factors	Function 1	Function 2
1	0.5307	0.3821
2	0.6201	0.1998
3	0.1951	-0.2854
4	-0.5439	0.8559
5		
6		
% of Variance	85.2	14.8

Group Means on Discriminant Functions

Group	Function 1	Function 2
1	5.08	2.48
2	3.61	3.03
3	3.73	2.69
4	3.20	2.35

Overall F-ratio 3.02 (df = 12, 241) $p < .01$

Table 57

To Have Dignity

Items	Rotated Factor Matrix I	II	III	IV
Respect yourself	-0.07	-0.58	1.83*	0.47
Be independent	-0.32	-0.10	1.74*	0.19
Stand up for your ideas	0.25	-0.58	0.89	1.31*
Believe in yourself	0.32	-0.49	0.59	1.62*
Conform to society	1.76*	0.28	-0.20	0.36
Be proud of yourself	0.47	0.32	-0.03	1.59*
Be modest	-0.18	1.19*	-0.48	1.82*
Don't show emotion	-0.22	2.45*	-0.13	0.23
Have money	0.54	1.22*	0.54	-0.47
Have a good job	0.48	1.19*	1.02*	-0.87
Respect others	-0.39	0.47	0.98	0.85
Be honorable	-0.42	0.04	1.91*	0.06
Be educated	0.48	0.34	1.76*	-0.95
Dress well	2.07*	-0.20	0.52	-0.52
Be well known	2.33*	-0.19	-0.42	0.34

1. Social criteria
2. Aloofness
3. Internal criteria
4. Pride--modesty

Factor Correlation Matrix

	1	2	3	4
1				
2	0.89			
3	0.91	0.91		
4	0.88	0.87	0.95	

*Highest factor loadings

Table 57 (Continued)

Group Means on Original Factor Scores

Group	1	2	3	4
1	1.52	1.47	4.74	4.02
2	1.99	2.30	3.92	2.95
3	2.85	2.30	3.98	3.12
4	2.67	2.58	3.65	2.88

Discriminant Functions

Factors	Function 1	Function 2
1	0.6399	-0.7432
2	0.3794	0.5949
3	-0.6116	-0.0906
4	-0.2695	-0.2924
5		
6		
% of Variance	88.8	10.5

Group Means on Discriminant Functions

Group	Function 1	Function 2
1	-2.45	-1.86
2	-1.04	-1.33
3	-0.58	-2.02
4	-0.32	-1.62

Overall F-ratio 5.43 (df = 12, 246) $p < .01$

Table 58

"If you have dignity, you..."

Items	Rotated Factor Matrix I	II	III	IV
Try to live up to it	0.33	-0.08	0.12	1.56*
Are good to other people	2.01*	-0.37	-0.21	0.22
Have more self-respect	0.84	0.06	-0.44	1.39*
Have respect from others	1.76*	0.16	-0.74	0.65
Are not liked by some people	0.58	1.12*	-0.59	0.73
Feel proud	-0.31	0.19	-0.19	1.99*
Keep your cool	-0.03	-0.43	0.67	1.34*
Are happy	-0.37	-0.17	0.65	1.59*
Can do what you like	-0.59	0.54	1.72*	0.42
Are trusted by people	0.29	0.12	1.73*	-0.08
Are polite to everyone	1.10*	-0.35	1.40*	-0.30
Respect other people	2.12*	-0.12	0.44	-0.57
Have a sense of decency	1.60*	0.19	0.41	-0.13
Get beaten up	0.72	1.82*	0.08	-0.55
Act like you are better than others	-0.35	2.65*	0.14	0.12

1. Concern for others
2. Snobbishness and received hostility
3. Good image
4. Pride

Factor Correlation Matrix

	1	2	3	4
1				
2	0.84			
3	0.93	0.86		
4	0.96	0.86	0.94	

*Highest factor loadings

Table 58 (Continued)

Group Means on Original Factor Scores

Group	1	2	3	4
1	3.98	1.55	3.33	4.13
2	3.52	2.02	2.93	3.53
3	3.31	1.93	3.22	4.12
4	3.32	1.73	2.96	3.37

Discriminant Functions

Factors	Function 1	Function 2	Function 3
1	-0.3117	-0.9292	-0.4680
2	-0.0875	0.3381	-0.8230
3	0.1530	-0.0716	0.3143
4	0.9337	0.1309	-0.0703
5			
6			
% of Variance	58.0	32.8	9.21

Group Means on Discriminant Functions

Group	Function 1	Function 2	Function 3
1	2.98	-2.87	-2.39
2	2.47	-2.34	-2.64
3	3.13	-2.12	-2.41
4	2.41	-2.27	-2.29

Overall F-ratio 1.74 (df = 12, 238) $.10 > p > .05$

Table 59

To Buy a Car

Items	I	II	III	IV
	Rotated Factor Matrix			
Find a good deal	-0.20	2.21*	-0.60	0.10
Have money	-0.19	1.77*	0.12	-0.09
Have a job	-0.02	1.51*	0.09	0.20
Need to travel a lot	0.60	0.28	0.35	1.88*
Have taken care of other needs	0.13	0.68	0.67	0.55
Have a good credit rating	0.08	0.06	1.51*	0.75
Shop around for one you like	-0.08	0.38	1.32*	0.57
Be able to bargain with the dealer	0.58	0.45	0.74	0.31
Have a drivers license	1.04*	0.06	1.04*	-1.15*
Be dependable	1.52*	-0.41	1.04*	-0.44
Want status (people looking up to you)	2.63*	-0.18	-0.48	0.30
Get a loan	1.40*	0.71	-0.39	-0.03
Know how to take care of it	0.51	0.98	0.32	-1.18*
Be able to afford insurance	-0.47	0.71	1.33*	-0.75
Be old enough to buy one	-0.47	-0.47	2.59*	0.03

1. Social and practical
2. Financial
3. Pure practical
4. Necessity

Factor Correlation Matrix

	1	2	3	4
1				
2	0.94			
3	0.93	0.97		
4	0.42	0.47	0.45	

*Highest factor loadings

Table 59 (Continued)

Group Means on Original Factor Scores

Group	1	2	3	4
1	2.89	4.50	4.43	0.38
2	3.41	4.57	3.44	0.30
3	2.84	4.54	3.96	0.71
4	2.74	4.00	3.72	0.63

Discriminant Functions

Factors	Function 1	Function 2	Function 3
1	0.5037	-0.1643	0.3107
2	0.4238	0.8955	-0.5096
3	-0.7227	0.3715	0.4097
4	-0.2110	-0.1822	-0.6899
5			
6			
% of Variance	75.1	17.0	7.88

Group Means on Discriminant Functions

Group	Function 1	Function 2	Function 3
1	0.08	5.14	0.15
2	1.10	4.76	-0.07
3	0.34	4.94	-0.29
4	0.25	4.40	-0.10

Overall F-ratio 2.14 (df = 12, 246) $p < .05$

Table 60

"If you buy a car, you..."

	Rotated Factor Matrix			
Items	I	II	III	IV
Work hard to pay for it	0.43	0.98	-0.12	0.40
Keep it in good shape	0.17	1.19*	0.08	0.41
Can do what you want in it	0.66	0.88	0.03	0.14
Have people looking up to you	1.47*	-0.09	0.19	0.01
Take your friends around in it	1.96*	0.51	-0.30	-0.49
Impress your girlfriend (Boyfriend)	1.99*	-0.48	0.02	0.22
Have more fun	0.99	-0.37	0.45	0.85
Drive safely	0.07	-0.52	0.10	2.06*
Get insurance	-0.27	0.01	-0.07	1.97*
Are happy	-0.02	0.31	0.14	1.27*
Can get to work easier	-0.08	1.25*	-0.44	0.66
Spend money for gas and oil	-0.30	1.23*	-0.32	0.87
Learn how to repair it	-0.07	2.14*	0.29	-0.72
Show it off	-0.16	0.53	2.22*	-0.05
Race it	0.02	-0.18	2.78*	0.05

1. Social success
2. Practical consideration
3. Showing off
4. Responsible driving

Factor Correlation Matrix

	1	2	3	4
1				
2	0.94			
3	0.88	0.86		
4	0.94	0.97	0.84	

*Highest factor loading

Table 60 (Continued)

Group Means on Original Factor Scores

Group	1	2	3	4
1	3.26	4.44	1.60	4.76
2	3.63	4.02	2.30	3.94
3	3.78	4.35	2.11	4.18
4	3.12	3.36	1.61	3.60

Discriminant Functions

Factors	Function 1	Function 2
1	0.5537	-0.5436
2	0.7050	0.0962
3	0.4359	-0.3889
4	0.0798	0.7376
5		
6		
% of Variance	58.5	38.5

Group Means on Discriminant Functions

Group	Function 1	Function 2
1	6.01	1.54
2	6.16	0.43
3	6.41	0.63
4	5.08	0.66

Overall F-ratio 2.52 (df = 12, 238) $p < .01$

Table 61

"To do your own thing, you have to..."

Items	Rotated Factor Matrix I	II	III	IV
Have something you like to do	1.82*	-0.07	0.20	-0.26
Be willing to give up other things to do it	1.35*	0.15	0.56	0.30
Be "cool"	-0.10	0.06	2.20*	0.04
Make sure you don't hurt anybody	0.62	1.35*	0.56	-0.60
Be independent	-0.04	1.80*	0.04	-0.07
Be mature (grown up)	-0.23	1.44*	-0.31	0.76
Try out a lot of different things to find out what you want	0.55	0.68	0.35	0.19
Learn how to do it well	-0.50	0.46	0.29	1.45*
Make the opportunity	-0.15	0.32	0.18	1.32*
Know what's happening around you	0.12	-0.27	-0.08	1.74*
Have friends to help you	0.35	-0.26	0.22	1.12*
Want to express yourself	1.23*	-0.38	-0.43	0.90
Not be afraid of what other people say	1.36*	-0.81	0.83	0.36
Just be yourself	1.40*	0.55	-0.65	0.10
Let it be natural, not forced	1.88*	0.17	-0.58	-0.06

1. Natural interests
2. Maturity
3. Coolness
4. Ability--awareness

Factor Correlation Matrix

	1	2	3	4
1				
2	0.96			
3	0.92	0.91		
4	0.96	0.95	0.91	

*Highest factor loadings

Table 61 (Continued)

Group Means on Original Factor Scores

Group	1	2	3	4
1	5.14	4.12	1.91	4.45
2	4.19	3.75	2.30	3.58
3	4.26	3.37	2.56	3.81
4	3.64	3.74	2.68	3.90

Discriminant Functions

Factors	Function 1	Function 2	Function 3
1	0.8025	0.4017	0.1405
2	-0.1130	-0.7837	0.4279
3	-0.5740	0.4237	-0.0119
4	-0.1172	-0.2118	-0.8928
5			
6			
% of Variance	77.8	15.6	6.62

Group Means on Discriminant Functions

Group	Function 1	Function 2	Function 3
1	2.04	-1.29	-1.51
2	1.20	-1.04	-1.03
3	1.12	-0.65	-1.40
4	0.51	-1.16	-1.40

Overall F-ratio 3.57 (df = 12, 246) $p < .01$

Table 62

"If you 'do your own thing', you..."

Items	Rotated Factor Matrix			
	I	II	III	IV
Are satisfied with yourself	0.96	0.34	-0.64	0.78
Feel free	0.70	0.51	-0.80	0.86
Have other people putting you down	0.08	-0.55	0.29	1.76*
Are happy	0.42	0.65	-0.56	0.83
Don't depend on others	-0.51	0.12	0.33	1.84*
Have friends	0.58	0.78	-0.40	0.54
Have purpose in your life	1.09*	0.72	-0.11	-0.00
Get in trouble	-0.11	0.29	2.32*	0.30
Enjoy life more	1.41*	0.79	0.18	-0.57
Aren't tied down by society	1.65*	-0.67	0.48	0.32
Feel you have done something important	1.84*	0.14	-0.25	-0.32
Are mature (grown up)	2.24*	-0.63	0.31	-0.17
Ignore society's rules	0.47	0.09	2.12*	0.01
Keep trying to make yourself better	-0.08	1.75*	0.25	-0.04
Are responsible for yourself	-0.36	2.24*	0.27	-0.15

1. Self-actualization
2. Responsibility
3. Trouble
4. Independence and rejection by others

Factor Correlation Matrix

	1	2	3	4
1				
2	0.96			
3	0.76	0.75		
4	0.96	0.95	0.79	

* Highest Factor loadings

Table 62 (Continued)

Group Means on Original Factor Scores

Group	1	2	3	4
1	4.11	4.38	0.96	3.80
2	4.30	4.00	1.65	4.27
3	4.05	4.00	1.25	3.93
4	3.35	3.40	1.39	3.48

Discriminant Functions

Factors	Function 1	Function 2
1	0.6395	-0.1994
2	0.6531	0.5469
3	0.1319	-0.6537
4	0.3836	-0.4836
5		
6		
% of Variance	69.2	30.2

Group Means on Discriminant Functions

Group	Function 1	Function 2
1	7.08	-0.89
2	7.21	-1.81
3	6.88	-1.34
4	5.88	-1.40

Overall F-ratio 2.14 (df = 12, 238) $p < .05$

Table 63

To Buy Fine Clothes

Items	Rotated Factor Matrix I	II	III	IV
Have money	-0.36	2.90*	-0.15	-0.22
Know how to budget your money	0.01	2.57*	-0.45	0.11
Be the kind of person who wears nice things	-0.35	1.85*	-0.34	1.06*
Go to a good store	-0.72	1.63*	0.67	0.41
Have pride in the way you look	0.19	2.05*	0.39	-0.49
Have good taste	0.22	1.87*	0.52	-0.51
Have a job	0.94	1.51*	0.18	-0.43
Know what you want before you buy	0.54	1.48*	-0.48	0.71
Be good-looking	2.32*	-0.19	-0.28	0.10
Want to impress people	1.10*	-0.04	1.16*	-0.16
Have a place to wear them	0.71	0.81	0.30	0.34
Think you are "cool"	0.56	-0.57	0.29	1.80*
Have friends that dress well	-0.20	0.06	0.07	2.09*
Want to impress women	-0.37	-0.24	2.21*	0.23
Think they will help you get ahead	0.03	0.15	1.70*	-0.06

1. Appearance
2. Financial and personal factors
3. Impression on others
4. Social pressure

Factor Correlation Matrix

	1	2	3	4
1				
2	0.91			
3	0.91	0.93		
4	0.90	0.90	0.92	

*Highest factor loadings

Table 63 (Continued)

Group Means on Original Factor Scores

Group	1	2	3	4
1	1.88	3.34	2.54	2.23
2	2.92	2.77	2.99	3.03
3	2.58	3.18	3.28	2.38
4	2.57	2.74	3.11	2.59

Discriminant Functions

Factors	Function 1	Function 2	Function 3
1	0.4173	0.2030	-0.6025
2	-0.8476	-0.2021	-0.7608
3	0.0292	0.7481	0.2050
4	0.3265	-0.5987	-0.1276
5			
6			
% of Variance	72.2	22.1	5.69

Group Means on Discriminant Functions

Group	Function 1	Function 2	Function 3
1	-1.25	0.27	-3.44
2	-0.06	0.46	-3.64
3	-0.74	0.91	-3.61
4	-0.31	0.75	-3.32

Overall F-ratio 2.46 (df = 12. 246) $p < .01$

Table 64

"If you buy fine clothes, you..."

	Rotated Factor Matrix				
Items	I	II	III	IV	V
Show yourself off	-0.11	2.41*	-0.06	-0.00	0.06
Impress people	-0.01	1.67*	0.59	0.08	-0.26
Take care of them	-0.20	0.92	1.77*	-0.21	-0.51
Go to fancy places	1.08*	1.20*	-0.71	0.19	0.51
Meet more women (men)	1.75*	0.23	-0.38	0.37	-0.08
Get compliments from people	2.12*	-0.21	0.12	-0.36	-0.22
Look respectable	1.41*	-0.21	0.44	-0.38	0.42
Are proud of yourself	-0.22	0.59	0.66	-0.13	1.13*
Get ahead at work	0.02	-0.01	-0.31	0.04	2.22*
Believe more in yourself	-0.14	-0.04	0.06	0.08	2.07*
Are happy	0.18	-0.30	1.05*	-0.27	0.89
Look good	0.13	-0.66	1.69*	0.04	0.17
Gave them for special occasions	0.68	-0.29	0.86	1.02*	-0.51
Get respect	0.11	-0.23	0.55	0.94	0.50
Have to give up other things	-0.14	0.05	-0.11	2.51*	0.04

1. Social acceptance
2. Good impression
3. Good feeling
4. Sacrifice
5. Pride, advancement

Factor Correlation Matrix

	1	2	3	4	5
1					
2	0.92				
3	0.95	0.92			
4	0.91	0.88	0.92		
5	0.92	0.89	0.94	0.89	

*Highest factor loadings

Table 64 (Continued)

Group Means on Original Factor Scores

Group	1	2	3	4	5
1	3.73	2.64	4.50	2.22	2.80
2	3.78	2.64	3.90	2.46	2.97
3	3.68	2.81	4.53	2.48	3.12
4	3.23	2.33	3.52	2.56	2.90

Discriminant Functions

Factors	Function 1	Function 2	Function 3
1	0.0109	0.2568	0.8327
2	0.2991	-0.5107	0.2098
3	0.8226	0.0766	-0.4650
4	-0.4241	-0.4337	-0.0913
5	-0.2322	-0.6923	0.1942
6			
% of Variance	82.8	9.36	7.80

Group Means on Discriminant Functions

Group	Function 1	Function 2	Function 3
1	2.94	-2.94	1.90
2	2.31	-3.20	2.23
3	2.82	-3.38	1.92
4	1.88	-3.21	1.86

Overall F-ratio 1.72 (df = 15, 246) $p < .05$

Table 65

"To get a girlfriend (or boyfriend), you have to..."

Items	Rotated Factor Matrix I	II	III	IV	V
Be well-liked	2.19*	-0.17	0.02	-0.16	-0.23
Dress well	1.49*	-0.21	-0.29	0.43	0.47
Be good-looking	1.60*	0.08	-0.09	0.23	0.15
Be friendly to everyone	0.77	-0.04	1.10*	-0.13	-0.15
Respect yourself	+0.00	-0.17	1.41*	-0.02	0.49
Be willing to sacrifice for another person	0.07	0.10	1.94*	-0.34	-0.49
Respect the other person	-0.31	0.01	1.65*	0.10	0.11
Be yourself (not phoney)	-0.41	-0.65	1.42*	0.85	0.43
Have a good line (rap, be "cool")	0.03	0.16	-0.07	2.35*	-0.07
Let him (or her) know you are interested (dig them)	-0.31	0.10	-0.09	0.18	2.13*
Have a good personality	0.22	0.09	0.29	-0.55	1.72*
Show affection (liking) for the other person	0.17	0.04	-0.18	-0.06	1.96*
Have money	-0.14	2.43*	-0.08	0.17	0.09
Meet a lot of people	0.49	1.03*	0.86	-0.52	-0.16
Want to go with one person instead of a lot	0.30	0.51	0.50	0.78	-0.08

1. Social acceptance
2. Money
3. Sincerity
4. Line
5. Show affection

Factor Correlation Matrix

	1	2	3	4	5
1					
2	0.89				
3	0.95	0.89			
4	0.90	0.86	0.92		
5	0.92	0.87	0.95	0.92	

*Highest factor loadings

Table 65 (Continued)

Group Means on Original Factor Scores

Group	1	2	3	4	5
1	2.86	1.38	5.05	1.92	3.74
2	3.73	2.53	4.69	2.60	3.30
3	2.97	1.94	3.94	2.83	3.50
4	3.09	2.24	3.82	2.38	3.29

Discriminant Functions

Factors	Function 1	Function 2	Function 3
1	0.1568	-0.5127	0.0882
2	0.3729	-0.5082	-0.3777
3	-0.7856	-0.3322	0.3092
4	0.4680	0.1957	0.8324
5	-0.1688	0.5746	-0.2470
6			
% of Variance	67.0	26.8	6.20

Group Means on Discriminant Functions

Group	Function 1	Function 2	Function 3
1	-2.17	-1.31	1.97
2	-1.00	-2.35	2.18
3	-0.64	-1.25	2.24
4	-0.62	-1.63	1.78

Overall F-ratio 3.81 (df = 15, 254) $p < .01$

Table 66

"If you have a girlfriend (or boyfriend), you..."

Items	Rotated Factor Matrix I	II	III
Share your experiences	-0.51	0.52	1.80*
Have sex	-0.38	-0.20	2.25*
Have more drive	0.76	-0.30	1.21*
Have more fun	0.69	-0.47	1.53*
Try to treat her (him)well	1.42*	-0.28	0.69
Have someone to help with your problems	1.81*	-0.23	0.08
Feel more confident	2.10*	0.05	-0.41
Are happier than before	1.78*	-0.29	0.20
Think about getting married	1.96*	-0.16	-0.32
Lose some of your freedom	1.78*	0.61	-0.70
Spend money on her (him)	0.92	0.36	0.43
Worry more	-0.13	2.15*	-0.21
Go out more often	0.15	1.19*	0.55
Share personal feelings	0.84	0.81	0.30
Grow up	0.35	0.80	0.82

1. Feel good about relationship
2. Worry
3. Fun--sex

Factor Correlation Matrix

	1	2	3
1			
2	0.94		
3	0.96	0.94	

*Highest factor loadings

Table 66 (Continued)

Group Means on Original Factor Scores

Group	1	2	3
1	4.62	3.31	4.36
2	3.75	3.31	3.32
3	3.68	2.98	4.11
4	3.54	2.44	3.46

Discriminant Functions

Factors	Function 1	Function 2	Function 3
1	0.6250	0.3474	-0.7427
2	0.4936	0.5301	0.6171
3	0.6047	-0.7735	0.2601
4			
5			
6			
% of Variance	55.9	30.7	13.4

Group Means on Discriminant Functions

Group	Function 1	Function 2	Function 3
1	7.16	-0.01	-0.26
2	5.98	0.48	0.12
3	6.26	-0.32	0.18
4	5.51	-0.15	-0.22

Overall F-ratio 4.63 (df = 9, 222) $p < .01$

POLITICAL ACTIVITY

Table 67

"To join a militant or revolutionary group, you have to..."

Items	Rotated Factor Matrix				
	I	II	III	IV	V
Understand social problems	2.30*	-0.21	-0.30	0.63	-0.05
Understand what the group wants	2.07*	0.12	0.13	-0.28	-0.04
Want to help the cause	1.91*	0.16	0.20	-0.31	0.04
Be willing to fight	0.93	0.30	1.17*	-0.62	0.11
Want revenge on another group of people	-0.16	-0.33	1.92*	0.50	0.04
Believe that they (the militants) are right	0.15	0.08	0.70	-0.65	1.40*
Feel you are oppressed (put down)	-0.21	-0.20	0.35	-0.23	1.96*
Have friends in such a group	-0.12	-0.14	0.07	0.07	1.92*
Want to change society	0.25	0.39	-0.99	0.67	1.86*
Be immature (not grown up)	0.23	-0.14	0.03	2.52*	-0.02
Not care what happens to you	-0.05	-0.05	0.13	2.13*	0.40
Feel unsure (unsafe)	-0.12	0.58	0.60	1.70*	-0.45
Have courage (guts)	-0.51	1.64*	0.81	-0.03	0.06
Find a group with good leaders	0.14	2.11*	-0.03	-0.29	-0.03
Have respect for authority	0.04	2.38*	-0.43	0.19	0.01

1. Ideology
2. Followership
3. Outgroup hate
4. Immaturity
5. Oppression

Factor Correlation Matrix

	1	2	3	4	5
1					
2	0.93				
3	0.90	0.90			
4	0.77	0.82	0.83		
5	0.92	0.90	0.94	0.83	

*Highest factor loadings

Table 67 (Continued)

Group Means on Original Factor Scores

Group	1	2	3	4	5
1	3.41	2.61	2.99	1.18	3.85
2	2.88	2.68	2.97	1.70	3.47
3	3.27	3.17	3.33	1.83	3.51
4	2.54	2.65	2.48	1.64	2.36

Discriminant Functions

Factors	Function 1	Function 2	Function 3
1	0.3237	0.190.	-0.7191
2	-0.2226	0.5838	-0.0916
3	-0.0156	0.4502	-0.0900
4	-0.2615	0.5492	0.4760
5	0.8815	-0.3447	0.4897
6			
% of Variance	73.1	22.7	4.15

Group Means on Discriminant Functions

Group	Function 1	Function 2	Function 3
1	3.56	2.84	-0.52
2	2.90	3.19	-0.07
3	2.92	3.77	-0.35
4	1.84	3.24	-0.36

Overall F-ratio 2.55 (df = 15, 254) $p < .01$

Table 68

"If you join a militant or revolutionary group, you..."

	Rotated Factor Matrix					
Items	I	II	III	IV	V	VI
Are in danger	-0.33	0.54	0.14	1.72*	0.79	-0.41
Wonder if you did the right thing	-0.14	0.34	0.20	2.09*	0.15	-0.12
Don't hear the other side	1.53*	-0.79	-0.12	0.58	0.42	0.27
Try to get others to join	2.09*	0.32	0.20	-0.39	-0.10	-0.29
Get arrested	0.55	-0.23	-0.34	0.96	-0.24	1.13*
Get into fights	0.43	-0.13	-0.47	1.33*	-0.37	1.18*
Feel like you are a part of the group	0.57	1.63*	0.09	0.02	-0.28	-0.06
Stand up for what you believe	-0.18	2.00*	-0.09	0.36	0.07	0.01
Lose your job (or get kicked out of school)	-0.02	-0.29	0.06	0.40	1.92*	-0.03
Feel proud	0.20	-0.20	1.93*	0.11	0.34	-0.27
Work harder for the cause	0.12	0.51	1.57*	0.01	-0.53	0.25
Get more respect from others	-0.39	-0.59	1.12*	0.06	-0.11	1.48*
Make new friends	-0.28	0.22	-0.13	-0.53	0.30	2.01*
Have more self-respect	-0.04	0.91	-0.10	-0.13	-0.06	0.98
Learn more about the world	0.29	0.70	-0.05	-1.42*	1.32*	0.59

1. Evangelism
2. Group feeling
3. Pride
4. Doubt and danger
5. Informal education
6. Reputation for toughness

Factor Correlation Matrix

	1	2	3	4	5	6
1						
2	0.90					
3	0.89	0.93				
4	0.88	0.85	0.83			
5	0.91	0.90	0.88	0.88		
6	0.92	0.94	0.92	0.86	0.89	

---

*Highest factor loadings

Table 68 (Continued)

Group Means on Original Factor Scores

Group	1	2	3	4	5	6
1	2.85	3.65	3.03	2.18	2.65	3.23
2	3.13	3.02	2.86	2.02	2.62	3.45
3	2.97	3.43	2.92	2.52	2.61	3.42
4	2.40	3.06	2.60	1.62	2.61	3.07

Discriminant Functions

Factors	Function 1	Function 2	Function 3
1	0.0779	-0.5198	-0.5917
2	0.4045	0.7333	-0.2925
3	0.1884	-0.0124	-0.3693
4	0.8299	0.0472	0.5238
5	-0.3142	0.1481	0.0188
6	0.0857	-0.4096	0.3916
% of Variance	74.9	20.6	4.5

Group Means on Discriminant Functions

Group	Function 1	Function 2	Function 3
1	3.52	0.33	-1.42
2	3.16	-0.38	-1.33
3	3.73	0.04	-1.13
4	2.70	0.16	-1.18

Overall F-ratio 1.47 (df = 18, 249) .10 > p > .05

Table 69

"To join a demonstration, you have to..."

	Rotated Factor Matrix				
Items	I	II	III	IV	V
Believe in the cause	0.93	-0.61	0.05	1.86*	-0.38
Be a leader	0.08	-0.80	1.59*	0.74	0.09
Have respect for authority	-0.24	0.08	-0.27	1.87*	0.48
Know what is going on	0.01	0.21	-0.28	1.98*	0.19
Ask questions about the issue	-0.69	0.85	0.48	1.61*	-0.27
Want to belong to a group	-0.33	2.19*	-0.02	0.46	-0.25
Have friends that are demonstrating	0.30	1.99*	-0.26	-0.45	0.59
Want to change the society	1.34*	0.97	0.74	-0.55	-0.60
Not be afraid of getting arrested	1.42*	0.75	0.09	0.38	-0.78
Agree with the way the demonstration in run	1.82*	-0.18	0.03	0.04	0.34
Be angry at some situation or policy	2.06*	-0.30	-0.33	0.03	0.41
Join a radical organization (like Black Panthers, SDS)	0.28	-0.10	-0.16	0.16	2.07*
Think that demonstrations are "the thing to do" (fashionable)	-0.10	0.43	0.41	-0.18	1.62*
Want to convert people to your side	0.03	0.33	1.04*	0.08	0.71
Think that you cannot get results without it	-0.11	0.06	2.32*	-0.29	-0.04

1. Ideology
2. Social pressure
3. Leadership
4. Intellectual agreement
5. Fashion

Factor Correlation Matrix

	1	2	3	4	5
1					
2	0.92				
3	0.92	0.91			
4	0.93	0.91	0.92		
5	0.85	0.86	0.87	0.87	

*Highest factor loadings

Table 69 (Continued)

Group Means on Original Factor Scores

Group	1	2	3	4	5
1	3.46	2.90	3.08	3.07	1.64
2	2.86	2.73	2.67	2.78	1.89
3	3.14	2.59	2.87	3.13	2.34
4	2.75	2.98	2.75	2.96	1.66

Discriminant Functions

Factors	Function 1	Function 2	Function 3
1	0.3247	-0.8139	-0.3136
2	-0.6404	0.1534	0.1568
3	-0.0925	-0.3128	0.1319
4	-0.0492	0.0667	0.9272
5	0.6881	0.4601	-0.0022
6			
% of Variance	73.8	21.9	4.27

Group Means on Discriminant Functions

Group	Function 1	Function 2	Function 3
1	-0.04	-2.38	2.62
2	0.10	-1.69	2.46
3	0.55	-1.77	2.69
4	-0.27	-1.68	2.71

Overall F-ratio 1.35 (df = 15, 254) N/S

Table 70

"If you join a demonstration, you..."

Items	Rotated Factor Matrix I	II	III
Get arrested	-0.22	-0.18	2.28*
Feel you've done something good	0.67	-0.04	1.34*
Lose your job (or get kicked out of school)	-0.40	0.75	1.43*
Get into a fight	-0.13	0.01	2.03*
Feel like you're part of something, not alone	1.11*	-0.25	1.19*
Learn something about the world	1.09*	0.24	0.64
Are ready to demonstrate again	1.25*	0.30	0.31
Have more self-respect	1.79*	0.11	-0.20
Have trouble with parents	-0.27	1.77*	0.20
Make new friends	1.10*	0.81	-0.09
Feel frustrated (get bugged)	-0.23	2.15*	-0.18
Get more respect from others	0.56	1.05	-0.02
Feel proud	1.42*	0.53	-0.27
Work harder for the cause than before	2.03*	0.27	-0.70
Try to get others to join	2.54*	-0.82	0.13

1. Dedication
2. Frustration
3. Accept bad consequences for goals

Factor Correlation Matrix

	1	2	3
1			
2	0.95		
3	0.93	0.92	

*Highest factor loadings

Table 70 (Continued)

Group Means on Original Factor Scores

Group	1	2	3
1	3.34	3.61	2.35
2	3.44	3.43	2.97
3	3.41	3.42	2.86
4	3.27	2.90	2.39

Discriminant Functions

Factors	Function 1	Function 2
1	-0.1803	0.2481
2	0.5129	-0.7681
3	0.8393	0.5903
4		
5		
6		
% of Variance	59.3	40.7

Group Means on Discriminant Functions

Group	Function 1	Function 2
1	3.22	-0.55
2	3.63	-0.03
3	3.53	-0.09
4	2.91	-0.01

Overall F-ratio 1.47 (df = 9, 224) N/S